

REFERENCES

- 1 Karakozova Zh.K., Khasanov M.Sh. Kosmos kazakhskoi kultury. – Almaty: Evero, 2011. – 104 p.
- 2 Kondybai S. Argy kazak mifologiyasy. 12 tomdyk. – Almaty: Daik-Press, 2004. – T.1. – 512 p.
- 3 Filosofiya: Zhogary oku oryndary zhane kolledzh studentterine arналган okulyk // kurast. T.Kh. Gabitov; aud. B.M. Satershinov. – Almaty: Raritet, 2012. – 250 p.
- 4 Abzhapparova A., Tulemetova A., Begaliyeva G. Digitalization of cultural heritage in Kazakhstan // *Herald of the Kazakh National University. Cultural Studies Series*. – 2021. – №2(85). – P. 112–115.
- 5 Naurzbaeva Z. Vechnoye nebo kazakhov. – Almaty: Saga, 2013. – 704 p.
- 6 Suleimenova S. Digital representation of the Kazakh linguocultural code // *Language and Culture*. – 2022. – T. 13, №4. – P. 201–206.
- 7 Khasenov A. Kazirgi kazak tilindegi san esimder: filol. gylm. kand. ... avtoreferat. – Almaty, 1957. – 58 p.
- 8 Wang L. Ethnolinguistic study of sacred numbers in Turkic and Chinese cultures // *Journal of Ethnolinguistics and Cultural Studies*. – 2023. – T. 11, №2. – P. 155–162.
- 9 Smith J. Numbers as cultural codes in digital anthropology // *Anthropology in the Digital Age*. – 2021. – T. 8, №1. – P. 77–83.
- 10 Akhatova Z. Digitalization of Kazakh folklore: Sacred numbers in oral tradition // *Central Asian Journal of Literature and Folklore*. – 2023. – №1(7). – P. 73–79.
- 11 Zhanabergenova Zh. Multimedia representation of traditional Kazakh art and symbolism of numbers // *Art and Culture Studies*. – 2020. – T. 5, №3. – P. 88–92.
- 12 Mashani A. Aidyn ainalymdary. – Almaty: Alatau, 2008. – 296 p.
- 13 Fazylzhanova A., Seitbekova A., Kobdenova G., Seidamat A., Ayazbayev G. The issues of developing the historical subcorpus of the National Corpus of the Kazakh Language // *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics*. – 2025. – Vol. 21, No. 1. – P. 169–191.
- 14 Kudaibergen A., Myrzabayeva A., Sarbasova L. Virtual museums as tools for preserving Kazakh ethnocultural heritage // *Digital Humanities Review*. – 2020. – №6(4). – P. 54–60.
- 15 Kiynova Zh.K., Zhaunshiyeva Zh.B. Symbolic Meanings of Numerals in Kazakh Riddles // *ResearchGate*. – 2023. – P. 148–155.

Received: 25.05.2025

IRSTI 16.01.24

DOI: [10.59102/kufil/2025/iss3pp58-73](https://doi.org/10.59102/kufil/2025/iss3pp58-73)

Z. Kulmanova

Michigan State University, East Lansing, 48824, USA

THE COGNITIVE FOUNDATIONS OF THEOLINGUISTIC DISCOURSE IN KAZAKH AND ENGLISH

This paper investigates cognitive and cultural representation of theolinguistic discourse in Kazakh and English languages based on comparative-cognitive and discourse analysis techniques. Since theolinguistics is an interdisciplinary research field, it analyzes the relationship between religion and language and is a requirement for identifying linguistic representations and cultural-cognitive meanings of religious notions.

The research concentrates on central Islamic and Christian concepts of “God”, “spirit”, “sin”, and “faith” (iman) and investigates their semantic, metaphorical, and pragmatic properties. In Kazakh religious language, “God” is conceptualized as a transcendent, righteous “Creator” and is named by epithets like “Allah”, “Haq”, and “Rabby” in folklore and Quranic literature, while

English uses titles such as “God”, “Heavenly Father”, and “The Lord” in a more human-like manner, emphasizing personal and affective involvement. In Islamic discourse, the concept of “ruh” (spirit) is seen as the core of the human inner world and the foundation of one’s connection with God, life, and faith. In Christianity, the “Holy Spirit” is described as a source of spiritual renewal and divine guidance within the believer’s heart. Both religions have a similar notion of “sin” being tied to metaphors like dirt, burden, and darkness, which symbolize desecration of inner sanctity and spiritual wholeness. “Sin” in Christianity is presented as a spiritual disease in the course of human nature, a syndrome infecting the human relationship with God and passed from generation to generation. “Iman” (Faith) in Islam is a comprehensive system manifested through the unity of heart, actions, and speech.

The findings show distinctive features of linguistic representation of religious concepts in different cultures and languages, opening up new possibilities for the interpretation of the linguistic discourse. This evokes the importance of considering cultural context and the organization of concepts during translation, teaching, or explaining religious texts.

Key words: theolinguistics, cognitive linguistics, concept, God, spirit, faith, sin, Islam, Christianity, cultural code.

MAIN PROVISIONS

Theolinguistics is an interdisciplinary field that studies the interaction between language and religion. This area reveals the connections between language and spiritual worldview, cultural codes, and the moral structure of society. The concept of theolinguistic discourse aims to examine the cognitive nature of religious and moral texts, focusing on their semantic and pragmatic structure. In this context, language is viewed not only as a tool for communication but also as a cognitive representative of the cultural and faith-based system known as *Theoculture*. The theoretical foundations of this field are closely related to several major frameworks: cognitive linguistics (G. Lakoff, M. Johnson), social constructivism (P. Berger, T. Luckmann), cultural linguistics (A. Wierzbicka, C. Geertz), and the philosophy of language (L. Wittgenstein, M. Foucault).

G. Lakoff emphasizes that “language is a cognitive structure that organizes human experience”, highlighting the significant role of linguistic concepts in moral and religious cognition [1]. The metaphor theory developed by Lakoff and M. Johnson enables a deeper understanding of how religious notions are constructed in the human mind. This approach was further developed in Kazakh linguistics by R. Syzdykova, who explored the linguistic representation of moral concepts in relation to the national worldview. She emphasized that “language is the core of culture” and demonstrated that analyzing concepts such as “obligation” (*paryz*), “duty” (*mindet*), and “debt” (*qaryz*) helps uncover the deeper content of the national conceptual system. According to her, “every society has its own moral codes, and language functions as the carrier of these codes” [2]. A similar perspective was elaborated by French anthropologist M. Mauss (1990) in his seminal work “*The Gift*” [3], where he investigated the concepts of “obligation” and “debt” from a sociocultural standpoint. Mauss (1990) viewed the notion of “code” not merely as a legal or economic category, but also as a symbolic and moral relationship. This view was further refined by T. Asad in his studies of the cultural and political structures of religion.

In the culture of any nation, concepts such as “God”, “faith”, “sin”, “obligation”, and “spirit” are not confined to religious consciousness alone. They are deeply rooted in ethnocultural consciousness and are organic elements of national identity. They live in proverbs, folklore, and religious-educational literature. Up to the current time, some Kazakh scientists have made an important contribution, like A. Qaidar, B. Sagyndykuly, Zh. Mankeeva, etc. Their works show the interdependence of language and culture, and of national consciousness and worldview. From the perspective of comparative linguistics, V. V. Vinogradov (1986) and A. M. Shcherba (1974) emphasize the need to distinguish between conceptual content and cultural grounding when analyzing the structure of moral concepts across different languages.

Following current research, religious discourse is closely associated with both national identity and with cognitive processes of language. Khamzina and Zharykova (2025) say that in Alpamys Batyr epic religious vocabulary expresses the syncretism of Islam and ancient Turkic religions, constituting the spiritual face of the nation and establishing national self-awareness [4]. Orazbaeva et al. (2025) emphasize cognitive stability of the Kazakh language: regardless of its free word order, semantic roles are always unambiguous, which they explain in the Cognitive-Semantic Matching Model [5]. These mechanisms render the language able to express and organize religious ideas fruitfully. Hesse (2023) adds further that religious language is unthinkable without metaphors: not only do they contribute meaning but also imagistic perspectives, allowing the conceptualization of the transcendent [6]. Thus, the structure of beliefs, the cognitive structure of language, and the metaphorical expressivity of discourse become the main pillars of theolinguistic communication in Kazakh and English traditions.

The present study is aimed at identifying the cognitive foundations of theolinguistic discourse in the Kazakh and English languages. To achieve this, a combination of conceptual analysis, comparative-cultural, and discourse methods is employed. The theoretical framework of the research is based on the works of both foreign and Kazakhstani scholars in the fields of conceptual studies, cultural linguistics, and philosophy.

INTRODUCTION

In contemporary linguistics and religious studies, theolinguistics and cognitive linguistics are increasingly recognized as intersecting fields of inquiry. Language is not merely a means of communication. It also serves as a fundamental code of religious cognition and belief systems. Theolinguistics deals with religious texts' language form, meaning, and pragmatic use [7], whereas cognitive linguistics explains how conceptual systems in human minds are created through language [1]. Situated strategically at the crossroads of these two, theolinguistic discourse provides further insight into language and its cultural-cognitive aspects.

Religious discourse is religious concepts, beliefs, values, and norms use of language in any given language. Here, not only linguistic but also cognitive and cultural features are required. Religious texts in Kazakh and English, while rooted in different religious traditions, Islam and Christianity are constructed within similar cognitive processes. Such things as metaphorical expressions, conceptualization, systems of symbols, rituals, etc., are universal and constructed within particular culture-religion systems. Therefore, a comparative analysis of theolinguistic discourse in the two languages is essential for identifying intercultural connections between religious cognition and linguistic expression.

The aim of this study is to conduct a comparative analysis of the cognitive and semantic foundations of religious discourse in Kazakh and English. The research draws upon texts from the Qur'an and the Bible, as well as Ahmed Yasawi's wisdom and English language sermons. Central theolinguistic concepts such as "God", "obligation" (*paryz*), "sin", "faith" (*iman*), and "spirit" (*rukh*) are examined through the lens of cognitive models. This approach allows for a comprehensive understanding of how religious concepts are represented linguistically and culturally, and helps reveal their conceptual specificities. The study is anticipated to make new applied and theoretical contributions to cultural linguistics and theolinguistics research. The study is also capable of having a positive impact on the teaching and translation of Kazakh and English religious texts.

Research tasks of the study include: identifying key theolinguistic concepts in Kazakh and English religious discourse; analyzing metaphorical and conceptual models used to express them; comparing semantic structures and symbolic representations across both languages; investigating how these elements reflect religious and cultural worldviews. The research hypothesis is that despite religious tradition variation (Islam and Christianity), religious discourse in Kazakh and English displays the same cognitive structures due to universal conceptual mechanisms but retains culturally unique semantic characteristics. The scientific originality of this research is found in its effort to straddle the divide between cognitive linguistics and theolinguistics through cross-cultural

examination of religious texts in two separate languages and traditions. The research brings forth a distinct interdisciplinary methodology that has been underrepresented in past research. The degree of scientific development of the topic demonstrates that while individual studies have been conducted on religious discourse in either Kazakh or English, and on cognitive metaphor in religious texts (e.g., Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Kövecses, 2010), comparative research combining cognitive and theolinguistic perspectives across Islamic and Christian texts remains limited.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

For this study, key religious texts in both Kazakh and English were selected. The Kazakh-language sources include the translation of the Holy Qur'an by Khalifa Altay [8], the *Diwani Hikmet* collection of Khoja Ahmed Yasawi [9], as well as Kazakh religious phraseological units and proverbs. As for the English-language materials, the study relies on the *Holy Bible* (New International Version) [10] and fixed religious expressions in English.

The research employs the method of cognitive conceptual analysis to examine the cognitive structure and semantic representation of religious concepts. In addition, comparative discourse analysis is applied to investigate the structural and semantic features of religious discourse in Kazakh and English. Through the method of identifying metaphorical models and concepts, the study reveals the cognitive forms in which religious notions are represented. Furthermore, by comparing semantic fields and cultural codes, the research analyzes the cultural specificities and parallels within the religious discourses of both languages. This combination of methods provides a comprehensive cognitive and theolinguistic approach to the analysis.

The research addresses the following question: *What are the similarities and differences in the cognitive and semantic representations of core religious concepts in Kazakh and English religious discourse?* The working hypothesis assumes that despite the different theological traditions of Islam and Christianity, both languages utilize similar cognitive models in religious conceptualization, though culturally encoded in distinct ways. The study was conducted in four stages: (1) selection and classification of religious texts; (2) identification of key theological concepts; (3) application of cognitive-conceptual and discourse analysis methods; (4) cross-linguistic and cross-cultural comparison. The Kazakh dataset includes over 150 units from the Qur'an and *Diwani Hikmet*, alongside more than 50 phraseological expressions and proverbs. The English material comprises over 120 terms and expressions drawn from the Bible and English-language sermons. However, due to the large volume of collected materials, they are selected and analyzed in the article. This methodological framework ensures the reliability and depth of the comparative theolinguistic analysis.

RESULTS

Theolinguistic discourse in Kazakh and English was analyzed using comparative-conceptual and discourse-analytical methods to uncover the cognitive representation of religious concepts. As a result, it was found that fundamental religious concepts: “*God*”, “*obligation*” (*paryz*), “*sin*”, “*faith*” (*iman*), and “*spirit*” (*ruk*) are realized through distinct cognitive models in each linguistic and cultural context.

Concept of God. In Kazakh religious discourse, the concept of *God* is predominantly represented by terms such as “*Allah*”, “*Zharatushy*” (*The Creator*), “*Haq*” (*The Truth*), and “*Rabby*” (*Lord*). These appellations often appear in the translation of the Qur'an by Khalifa Altay and in “*Diwani Hikmet*” of Ahmed Yassawi. For instance, in the Kazakh expression “*Allanin rakhmeti ken*” (Allah's mercy is vast), God is depicted as the origin of pity and pardon. Additionally, Islam's 99 names of Allah provide explicit descriptions of the complex characteristics of God. In Yassawi's wisdom, the word “*Haq*” conveys the absolute nature of God: “*Ghasyqpyn dep aipas bolar, Haqtan khabary bolmasa*” (One cannot claim to be a lover if they have no knowledge of

Truth). In such expressions, the understanding of God takes on a metaphysical dimension and is associated with transcendence.

From a cognitive perspective, the Kazakh concept of “*God*” is constructed as an exalted being characterized by mercy and justice, and functions as an object of spiritual reverence and moral instruction [11]. In Kazakh religious texts, God’s nature is revealed through a wide range of attributes: *justice, mercy, sovereignty over the universe*, among others [12]. Epithets like “*Zharatushy*” (The Creator), “*Buiryq berushi*” (Commander), expressions like “*Qudaisy qurai da synbas*” (Even a straw doesn't break without God's will) enhance God's figure as ruler and guardian. Such epithets and descriptions of God in Kazakh religious and folklore language are common: “*Barlyq dūnienīn ıesi*” (The Lord of the universe), “*Aspan men zherdiń Hákimi*” (The Sovereign of the heavens and the earth) and emphasize God's authority and unlimited power. Traits such as “*Qúdiretti*” (The Almighty), “*Zharylqawshy*” (The Giver), “*Táwbeshilderdi keshirgish*” (The Forgiver of the Repentant) demonstrate God's mercy and compassion. Metaphorical phrases such as “*Qúdaıdyń kózi túzu bolsyn*” (May God’s eye be righteous), “*Qúdaı úirińdi zholǵa salsyn*” (May God guide your kin onto the right path) demonstrate God's role of being a constant observer, guardian, and witness in Kazakh religious poetry. Therefore, the meaning of God in Kazakh religious vocabulary covers a wide range of semantic fields and is filled with religious, cultural, and philosophical content. It runs deeply not only through Qur'anic and theological literature, but also in folklore and colloquial speech, and is expressed in a multi-dimensional and deep form.

English religious texts employ the terms “*God*”, “*The Lord*”, and “*Heavenly Father*” frequently. These terms anthropomorphize God as a personal being who addresses human beings, is concerned about them, and is emotionally close [13]. To speak of God as a “person” is to have a close, intimate relationship. This form of address, for example, is “*Our Father in heaven, hallowed be your name*” (Matthew 6:9). God is addressed as a father in heaven and conveys a sense of warmth, nearness, and familiarity in religious usage. Christian theology centers on the doctrine of the Trinity: “*the Father*”, “*the Son*”, and “*the Holy Spirit*”, three persons in one divine nature [14]. This is expressed in numerous biblical metaphors. In “*The Lord is my shepherd*” (Psalm 23:1, King James Bible), God is metaphorically equated with a shepherd, a protector, and a guide, as in the conceptual metaphor God as Shepherd [10]. Another, “*Whoever does not love does not know God, because God is love*” (1 John 4:8), actually equates God with love itself. The God is Love metaphor also conveys a very strong feeling of attachment between the believer and God [1]. These examples show how, in religious English, God is a very personalized and emotive character. God is not only characterized as some kind of powerful character but as someone close, loving, and inwardly concerned with the life of the believer [7]. Finally, Kazakh religious writings speak of God in terms of transcendence and metaphysical abstractness, usually as the Absolute and a symbol of justice. English religious writings, however, speak of God in anthropomorphized terms as a human being, an object of love and care. These linguistic and cultural variations add further to the cognitive sources of religious belief and structures on which language builds the divine.

Concept of Paryz (obligation, duty). In Kazakh religious discourse, the concept of “*paryz*” is not limited solely to religious duties within the framework of Sharia law. This notion encompasses a wide semantic field closely intertwined with historically established traditional moral values, family ethics, and spiritual upbringing. For example, in Kazakh folk wisdom, phrases such as “*Ata-ananyñ paryzyn ötemegen – Quday aldynda küñäli*” (He who does not fulfill his duty to his parents is sinful before God), “*Jumaq ananyq tabanyñ astynda*” (Paradise lies beneath a mother’s feet), and “*Anangdy Mekkegä arqalap aparsan da, qaryzyñnan qutylalamaysyñ*” (Even if you carry your mother to Mecca on your back, you will not be freed from your debt to her) illustrate that *paryz* is not merely a religious category but also an indicator of familial responsibility. Furthermore, there is a hadith in which a man recounts serving his mother during the pilgrimage and asks the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him), “*Men anamnyñ aq sütin aqtadym ba?*” (Have I repaid my mother’s breastfeeding?). The Prophet replied, “*Joq. Sen onyn bir tündik uayymyn da ötegen joqsyn*” (No. You have not even repaid one night of her worry). Here, *paryz* is not only an obligation before God but also the foundation of human dignity and conscience. This phrase reflects how religious and

traditional layers in the Kazakh worldview are inseparable and form an integrated linguocultural structure.

The particular nature of the “*paryz*” concept is also clearly reflected in Sufi literature. In Ahmed Yassawi’s *Diwani Hikmet*, the line “*Paryz namaz okysan, ruhyng tazarar*” (If you perform the *paryz* prayer, your spirit will be purified) portrays *paryz* not merely as a religious ritual, but as a symbol of inner discipline on the path to spiritual purification and perfection. In other words, “*paryz*” has a transcendent quality. It represents not only the connection between humans and God, but also a form of self-accountability and internal order. In Kazakh folklore and epic narratives, the concept of “*paryz*” similarly appears with a broad meaning. For instance, in the epic *Koblandy Batyr*, the hero’s defense of his people is regarded as his *paryz* (duty) to his nation. In the poem *Kyz Zhibek*, the tragedy that unfolds after Tolegen departs without his parents’ blessing is seen as a violation of *paryz*. This shows how religious duties have merged with cultural traditions to form a fundamental moral value in people’s lives. The Kazakh language captures this idea through phrases like “*paryzyn oteu*” (fulfilling one’s duty), “*paryzyn arqalau*” (carrying one’s duty), and “*paryzyn sezinu*” (feeling one’s duty), all of which reflect a deep sense of responsibility and conscious commitment to one’s obligations. The proverb “*Qaryz – malgha, paryz – zhanga*” (Debt is to wealth, *paryz* is to the soul) highlights the spiritual weight of *paryz* and its ethical and sacred character. In essence, *paryz* (obligation) is not an externally imposed command but a deeply ingrained spiritual and moral law within the individual. It is easy to see how *paryz* in Kazakh culture includes a wide and complex framework of ideas.

On the other hand, religious argument for Englishness revolves around ideas like duty or responsibility in the sense of obeying God’s commandments and adhering to moral law. Therefore, for instance, the scripture “*Fear God, and keep His commandments, for this is the duty of all mankind*” (Ecclesiastes 12:13) specifies mankind’s duty as obedience to God’s laws. Duty here appears to be a specific, bounded, legalistic thing. In the Protestant religion’s historical tradition within the English language tradition, obligation is rooted in hierarchical dependence, like God commands and human beings obey. Salvation is frequently construed as dependent upon ceaseless religious and moral discipline. Jesus demands, “*If you love me, keep my commands*” (John 14:15), reiterating this premise, assuming love of God lies in obedience. This is an instance of the conceptual metaphor “*Duty is proof of love*”. In everyday language, the concept of duty appears in such expressions as “*Do your duty, and God will do the rest*”, “*Call of duty*”, and “*Sacred duty*”. These expressions associate the concept of duty with religious, military, or legal contexts, emphasizing its character as a solemn obligation, something required, usually uncontestable, and grounded in a sense of higher power and moral obligation.

The differences between these concepts in Kazakh and English reflect their underlying worldviews. In Kazakh culture, “*paryz*” (obligation) is shaped at the intersection of divine command, social ethics, national tradition, and personal spiritual responsibility. It is closely tied to an individual’s inner sense of conscience and moral integrity. In contrast, within English religious discourse, *duty* typically carries a legal connotation. It is a specific, formal obligation that must be fulfilled. These distinctions also shape the cognitive structures of each concept. In Kazakh, the concept of *paryz* is reflected in conceptual metaphors such as “*paryz – kásietti zhauapkershilik*” (obligation is sacred responsibility), “*paryz – rukhani tárbie*” (duty is spiritual discipline), and “*paryz – ar-namys*” (duty is honor and dignity). In English, however, it appears through structures like “*duty is law*”, “*duty is obedience*”, and “*duty is proof of faith*”. These metaphorical models reveal distinct linguistic and cultural perspectives: in Kazakh, “*paryz*” evolves into an inner spiritual order intertwined with personal conscience, whereas in English, “*duty*” serves as the foundation of a formal, legal covenant between God and the believer.

Concept of Kúná (sin). The concept of *kúná* (sin) holds deep religious, ethical, and cultural significance in human civilization. In both Islamic and Christian teachings, it is defined as a violation of divine law and is linguistically represented through metaphors, idioms, and semantic fields. In Kazakh religious and folkloric discourse, *kúná* refers to actions that harm a person’s spiritual purity. At the lexical level, it commonly appears with words like “*aram*”, “*kharam*”, “*kúnáhár*”, “*tazalyq*”,

and “*táwbe*” (impure, forbidden, sinner, purity, repentance), forming a rich semantic field. For instance, in the phrase “*Kúnání kóp qylgannyń júzi qara bolady*” (The face of one who commits many sins turns black), “*júz*” (face) is metaphorically portrayed as an outward reflection of inner spiritual state, while “*qara*” (black) symbolizes sin and conveys conceptual associations like “*spiritual darkness*” and “*loss of divine light*”. In this context, *kúná* is expressed through binary oppositions such as “*jaryq/qarańgylyq*” (light/darkness), “*tazalyq/lastyq*” (purity/impurity), and “*joǵary/tómen*” (high/low). Other expressions such as “*Kúnási zhelkesinde túr*” (His sin is on his neck) and “*Kúnáǵa belsheden batqan*” (Drenched in sin up to the waist) depict sin as a heavy, invisible burden that constantly follows the individual. These reflect ontological metaphors like “*kúná = júk*” (sin is a burden), “*kúná = lastyq*” (sin is filth), and “*kúná = qarańgylyq*” (sin is darkness). In Sufi texts, particularly in the *hikmet* poems of Ahmed Yassawi, sin is portrayed as something that “*hardens*” the heart, “*plunges it into darkness*”, and “*diverts it from the path of truth*”. For example: “*Kóp kúnámen júrek qatty tasqa ainaldy*” (Due to many sins, the heart turned into stone). Here, sin metaphorically renders the heart cold, insensitive, and closed to divine truth, an example of the conceptual metaphor “*kúná = qattylyq/beiqamdyq*” (sin is hardness/heedlessness).

In Christian theology in English, sin is mostly a transgression of God's law. Semantically, it approaches words such as “*evil*”, “*guilt*”, “*temptation*”, “*fall*”, and “*disobedience*”. Figuratively, sin tends to be conceived as something concrete and damaging: “*a debt*”, “*a burden*”, “*a stain*”, or “*a disease*”. For example, “*Sin is a debt that must be paid*” makes “*sin*” a debt owed to God of a moral sort and employs legal and economic terminology (sin = debt). In “*The burden of sin weighs heavily upon the soul*”, sin is a heavy burden the soul has to bear—an ontological metaphor that attributes physical presence and weight to sin. The second, “*for all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God*” (Romans 3:23), uses the metaphor of “*falling short*” or being far off to human beings. Sin creates a distance between human beings and the perfection of God. As “*your iniquities have separated you from your God*” (Isaiah 59:2) describes sin as a power of separation, an alienation that breaks one's connection to God's presence.

While the metaphors employed by both Kazakh (*künä*) and English (*sin*) discourses are the same — “*darkness*”, “*burden*”, or “*filth*”— the formulation of these in terms of language varies as per conceptual and cultural frameworks. In both, yet, sin is a moral deficiency, spiritual crisis, and lack of nearness to the divine, which always takes place through profound, culturally rooted metaphors.

Objects	Kazakh	English
Kuna / Sin	Spiritual impurity, moral fault before God	Legal violation, estrangement from God
Metaphors	Black face, burden, dirt, stone heart	Debt, stain, separation, mark
Phraseology	Carrying sin, darkening of the face	Sin is a debt, stained by sin
Religious texts	Quran, Hikmet poems	Bible, Protestant doctrine
Cognitive system	Clean/unclean, light/dark	Law/breaking, debt/payment
Spiritual dimension	Heart, spirit, intention	Punishment, salvation, justice

Table 1. Discourse-cognitive comparison of the concept “*Künä*” (Sin)

Concept of Iman (Faith). In Kazakh, the concept of “*iman*” is a metaphorical structure at the cognitive level based on the heart and inner feelings. According to this structure, faith is understood as “*feeling with the heart*”, “*coming from the heart*”, meaning it is not rational but an emotional, spiritual intuition. The Kazakh concept of “*iman*” is mainly connected with a person's inner spiritual world, faith with the heart, and the purity and sincerity of the soul. For example: “*Iman – júrekten*” (faith is from the heart), “*Imansızda uiat joq*” (without faith, there is no shame), “*Imansızdan uiat keter*” (from lack of faith comes shame), “*Imansızda ar bolmaydı, arsızda jar bolmaydı*” (without faith there is no honor, without honor there is no spouse), “*Imandınıń júregi keń, imansızdıń júzi kereń*” (the faithful have a broad heart, the faithless have a blind face), “*Iman ketse,*

adamdıq da ketedi” (when faith leaves, humanity leaves), “*Iman – jürektiñ nūry, ğılım – aqıldiñ nūry*” (faith is the light of the heart, knowledge is the light of the mind). These expressions show that “*iman*” is directly connected with a person’s inner being, their heart’s intuition, emotional state, and is a sign of spiritual purity and moral responsibility. Here, the metaphors “*heart*” and “*honor-shame*” indicate that faith is based more on feeling and sincerity than on intellect. From a dialectical and linguocognitive perspective, the concept of “*iman*” is not only religious faith but also an expression of a person’s inner spiritual purity and sincerity.

In the works of Abay Qunanbayev, the close connection between “*iman*” (faith) and moral purity is also evident. For example, in his poems, the lines “*Iman bar jerde izgilik bar*” (where there is faith, there is goodness) clearly show that *iman* is understood broadly as a spiritual and moral concept. Additionally, in Kazakh proverbs, expressions like “*Imandy adam – imandy eldiñ tiregi*” (a faithful person is the support of a faithful nation) and “*Imandy eldiñ irgesi sögilmes*” (the foundation of a faithful nation will not be destroyed) emphasize the importance of *iman* as the spiritual pillar of the nation.

The concept of *iman* corresponds to the English word faith, which is mostly considered in theological and rational contexts. Its cognitive basis lies in the complex relationship between “*belief*” and “*knowledge*”. The cognitive model is: “*Faith*” is an unproven, unseen belief accepted by the intellect. As stated in Hebrews 11:1, “*Faith is the assurance of things hoped for, the conviction of things not seen*” — this cognitive model of faith stands between rational belief and dogmatic faith. The meaning of the word faith is not limited to spiritual belief but forms a semantic field including “*trust*”, “*belief*”, and “*hope*”. This cognitive network shows the multifaceted and socially and religiously contextual use of the faith concept. In English religious discourse, faith is often represented by metaphors of stability and guidance, such as *light* and *rock*. This portrays faith as a symbol of confidence and life direction. Faith is a concept that exists at the intersection of rational intellect and religious dogma. It is understood as “*knowledge beyond evidence*” — a belief accepted by the mind but lacking visible proof.

Cognitive Aspect	“Iman” (Kazakh)	“Faith” (English)
Basis	Faith is Heart	Faith as Rational Assurance
Emotional Component	Sincerity from the heart, spiritual purity	Belief based on reason and dogma
Semantic Field	Spiritual purity, sincerity, moral purity	Belief, hope, trust, dogmatic belief
Discursive Context	Spiritual consciousness, moral responsibility	Theological dogma, rational belief
Metaphors	Heart, purity, sincerity	Light, rock, assurance

Table 2. Cognitive-structural comparison of the concepts “Iman” and “Faith”

The Kazakh concept of “*iman*” is a cognitively grounded notion based on inner feelings and purity of heart, carrying strong emotional connotations. In Kazakh, faith is not only a religious belief but also a marker of spiritual purity and moral principles. On the other hand, English “*faith*” is understood in theological and rational terms as a kind of religious belief accepted by reason and without absolute evidence. Such oppositions mirror the individual cognitive, religious, and cultural structures in the two languages. Metaphors of Kazakh “*iman*” based on the heart express its emotional and spiritual sense, whereas English “*faith*” demonstrates the cognitive structure of belief with theological and rational characteristics.

Concept of Rukh (Spirit). In the Kazakh language, the concept of “*rukḥ*” often signifies a person’s higher, transcendent essence and is viewed as a direct link to God. For example, in traditional Kazakh understanding, “*rukḥ*” represents the elevated level of a person’s soul and reflects their connection to Allah. In Islamic teachings, “*rukḥ*” is also considered a special spiritual essence given to a person by Allah. It is seen as distinct from the body but closely connected to it.

In Kazakh folk worldview, the concepts of “*rukḥ*” and “*zhan*” (soul) are clearly differentiated in meaning. “*Rukḥ*” is the spiritual origin that connects a person to God and defines their inner purity

and moral-ethical perfection. From the perspective of cognitive linguistics, the concept of “*rukḥ*” is based on high-level metaphorical notions. For instance, “*rux*” is depicted as “*zharyq*” (light), “*aspan*” (sky), or “*zhuldyz*” (star)—metaphors symbolizing spiritual light and goodness in the mental map of a person's inner world. In Kazakh literature, the spirit is frequently described as “*zharyq saulesi*” (a ray of light), which enlightens the inner world of a person and guides their moral compass. These metaphors facilitate cognitive understanding and visualization of the spiritual world. The Qur'an mentions God breathing spirit into humans: “*Óz ruhymnan úrledim*” (Sad surah, 72-ayat) (“So when I have fashioned him and breathed into him of My spirit...” (Surah Sad, 72)), expressing that humans are created with a sacred spirit. This verse highlights the connection between a person and God in Kazakh spirituality and emphasizes the sanctity of the inner self. The saying “*Rukhyn taza bolsa, ishiñ de taza bolady*” (If your spirit is pure, your deeds will be pure) reflects the close link between spiritual purity and human actions. This wisdom demonstrates the way purity of the inner world defines the nature of outer behavior and activity. “*Rukḥ*” in Kazakh society is not merely a religious notion but a part of national education, culture, moral duty, national memory, and moral awareness.

“*Zhan*” is the life force of a living being, the essence behind the meaning of life. That is, “*zhan*” refers to the living organism and life energy of a person and is more connected to material existence compared to “*rukḥ*”. The Kazakh expression “*Janyñnyñ tynyshytygy – rukḥ tazalyǵynan*” (the peace of the soul comes from the purity of the spirit) reflects the harmony between a person's spiritual maturity and their inner soul. In Kazakh proverbs, there are phrases related to the soul such as “*Zhanym – arymnyñ sadaǵasy*” (soul is the sacrifice of honor), “*Zhan tattı, ar odan da tattı*” (the soul is sweet, but honor is even sweeter), “*Zhan qynalmai – tirshilik joq*” (no life without soul), and “*zhan bar jerde – úmit bar*” (where there is a soul, there is hope). These expressions depict “*zhan*” as a sign of living existence and life itself.

In conclusion, “*rukḥ*” is an inner doctrine that describes a person's moral-ethical and faith-based being, while “*zhan*” is a concept closely connected with life, vital energy, and the physical body. Although inseparable in the Kazakh worldview, they hold distinct meanings on a semantic level.

Religiously, “*Spirit*” is always most normally disputed in Christian theology as the “*Holy Spirit*”. It is part of the Trinity and divine existence of God, providing spiritual knowledge, guidance, and inspiration to human beings. For example, in the Gospel of John, the word “*The Holy Spirit will teach you all things*” (John 14:26) presents the Spirit as a teacher and guide, a human being reputed to impart human hearts with knowledge and wisdom. In this manner, the Spirit is hence symbolically considered as an individual leader. For instance, John 14:26 (NIV) says: “*But the Advocate, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, will teach you all things and will remind you of everything I have said to you*”, and this is a public demonstration of the Spirit as a helper and teacher. And, too, “*fruit of the Spirit*” (Galatians 5:22) is a reference to the work of the Spirit upon a man's nature: love virtues, joy, peace, and benevolence. That is a reminder of the identification of the Spirit with inborn moral and ethical holiness. The entirety of Galatians 5:22-23 (NIV) reads: “*But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness and self-control*”, stating that those virtues are of the Spirit within. More generally in English, “*Spirit*” is applied to refer to a person's internal spiritual space and energy. It's a word applied in a way that qualifies someone's ethical standing or internal motivation. For example, whenever individuals say “*a spirited person*”, they will mean someone who has much energy, enthusiasm, and life. Here, “*spirit*” is applied metaphorically for motivation and internal dynamism. Oxford English Dictionary defines “*spirited*” as full of energy, enthusiasm, and determination [12]. Even there are certain synonymous words in Kazakh, such as “*rukhy asqaq*” (high-spirited or resolute), “*rukhtandyru*” (to encourage or to inspire), and “*rukhyñ joǵaltpaı*” (not to lose one's willpower). Those indicate how close the concepts are to each other in the two languages.

The concept of “*Rukḥ/Spirit*” holds an important place in the religious discourses of both Kazakh and English as a source of spiritual purity and moral perfection. In Kazakh, the term “*rukḥ*” signifies the connection with God and a person's inner purity, while in English, “*Spirit*” often refers

to the Holy Spirit in the Christian context, representing spiritual knowledge and inspiration. Both concepts aim to express the higher, transcendent level of the human spirit, which is reflected through cognitive metaphors.

DISCUSSION

The concepts of “*God*”, “*spirit*”, “*sin*”, and “*faith*” in Islam and Christianity are not only theological but also significant as linguistic, cognitive, and discursive phenomena. Theolinguistics, as the field studying religious language and its cognitive structures, helps uncover the semantic scope, metaphorical imagery, and linguistic usage of these concepts.

In Islam, the name “*Allah*” in the Arabic monotheistic tradition conveys the meaning of absolute unity and transcendence. According to Muhammad Abd al-Jabbar, “*Allah is the eternal, unique Creator*” [16]. This concept appears in cognitive semantics as a high-level prototype, meaning the idea of God is constructed in the human mind as the highest, universal unity, with all related concepts subordinate to it. Other than that, the term “*Allah*” is not only the Creator but also the origin of virtues such as justice, mercy, and compassion. The connotation of this term is a general ethical and spiritual guide model in one's belief system. Thus, within Islamic discourse, the name “*Allah*” functions as a multi-aspect and multi-level cognitive concept that unifies believers' life experience and values.

In Christianity, “*God*” is strained by the doctrine of the Trinity. In Augustine's *De Trinitate*, it has been so defined as “*The Trinity is three distinct, yet one God*” [17]. Cognitively, this is a matter of conceptual integration, where three differential ideas (the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit) are unified into a single undivided concept. This oneness is conveyed on the linguistic level through metaphors and strategies of argumentation, such as the use of the label “*The Three of God*” for an advanced system of cognition. One of the remarkable aspects of this concept is that it exists in human consciousness both as three separate people and as a unified one, and that there exists a unique correlation between religious conviction and linguistic form. Besides, the concept of the Trinity is frequently depicted in Christian disputations on theology in common everyday metaphors such as “*ice – water – steam*” (ice becomes water, water becomes steam, and converts back again), which facilitates intellectual and mental perception and consolidates the believers' view.

So, the conceptual structures of the notion of God in Islam and Christianity are at the crossroads of language and mind, faith and knowledge, each being correspondent to their own cultural-historical and philosophic origins. These concepts rest upon metaphors and semantic models of religious speech, forming and directing believers' spiritual life. The “*ruh*” or soul in Islamic literature is the source of inner life, consciousness, and relation with God. Imam Ghazali writes that “*ruh is a special gift from Allah that animates human life*” [18]. This concept is often metaphorically expressed in language as a source of goodness and life (for example, “*ruh urleu*” (breathing spirit), “*ruh kotieru*” (lifting spirit)). The Quranic verse “*ruhhyndy urledim*” (Quran, 32:9) represents a cognitive model of the transfer of energy and life between humans and God.

Furthermore, the ruh is regarded as a vital element indicating a person's spiritual purity and motivation for worship. It is the basis of the everlasting relationship and belief between man and God. In Islamic philosophy, ruh has been referred to as the spiritual power that integrates the soul, consciousness, and heart. This underlines the point that it is not just the basis of worldly existence but also the basis of spirituality.

In Christian teachings, the Holy Spirit is known to be the force of truth and salvation. The essence of the Spirit is referred to by the Apostle Paul as “*he who raised Christ from the dead will also give life to your mortal bodies because of his Spirit who lives in you*” (Romans 8:11). Here, the semiotics of the Spirit are classically rendered in the terms of metaphors derived from human life force, i.e., light, heat, and breath. The Holy Spirit is to induce spiritual new birth in the hearts of the believers and infuse vigor into their faith and hope. Theologically, the Holy Spirit is the origin of the energy of Christian life that guides the faithful spiritually and enriches their spiritual lives in everyday life. Moreover, linguistic actions of the Holy Spirit in religious texts and liturgical language also tend

to call upon metaphors such as “*breath of the soul*”, “*spiritual light*”, and “*saving power*”, emphasizing its life-giving and transcendental nature.

In Islam, sin (günah) is understood as an act against God, described as the “darkening” of the heart and mind. From a theolinguistic perspective, the concept of sin has a negative cognitive frame and is described with words like “*kir*” (dirt), “*lastau*” (pollution), and “*buzu*” (corruption). Through this frame, sin is seen as a force that contaminates a person’s spiritual purity and weakens their connection with God. The Quran presents the discourse on sin as a binary opposition between spiritual “*tazalygy*” (purity) and “*lastygy*” (pollution), reflecting a dialectical structure where sin and righteousness stand opposed. Moreover, Islamic texts view sin not only as an individual’s fault but also as an indicator of the moral state of society, with consequences that affect not only the individual soul but also the overall social order and peace. The concept of sin is often expanded with metaphors such as “*zhuk*” (burden), “*auyrtpalyk*” (heaviness), and “*aralasu*” (interference), representing a complex cognitive pattern that conveys the inner suffering of the human soul.

In Christianity, sin is understood as a spiritual disease and the internal decline of a person against God. This concept is seen as the corruption of the human soul and the severance of the relationship with God. Apostle Paul’s words, “*for all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God*” (Romans 3:23), characterize sin as a universal and hereditary mental construct, i.e., sin is presumed to be a universal phenomenon that was cultivated out of human nature and culture. Apart from this, in Christian literature, sin is also characterized as a hindrance that estranges an individual from God and also as a dark, sealed-up space that checks spiritual growth. Here, sin is the contradiction and conflict within an individual’s inner self and the primary hindrance on the path towards spiritual purity. The cognitive and linguistic description of the sin notion in both religions enables a deeper understanding of its spiritual meaning and indicates the role of metaphors and word patterns in religious thought. These notions reveal the deep interdependency of religious experience and faith and are a precious tool for explaining an individual’s relation to God and to himself or herself.

In Islam, “*iman*” (faith) is understood as the unity of faith and action. Imam Ghazali describes this concept as “*jurekten senu, tilmen rastau zhane amaldarmen koldu*” (faith with the heart, confirmation by the tongue, and support through deeds) [18]. This definition highlights that “*iman*” is not just an inner belief but also requires outward expression through concrete actions. From the perspective of cognitive linguistics, “*iman*” is a faith schema within the internal cognitive structure of a person, closely linked with life experience and religious values. This schema works as an internal model that prescribes a human’s worldview, moral standards, and relations with the world. In linguistics, “*iman*” is best described in metaphorical terms such as “*zhurekke tuyilu*” (to be rooted in the heart) and “*zhurekke bailanu*” (to be tied to the heart), underscoring the significance of inner faith and stressing that religion leans more toward emotion and spirituality rather than pure reason. In addition, under an Islamic setting, “*iman*” has often been described in terms of metaphors of mental spaces of morality and spirituality, i.e., “*zhurek*” (heart) and “*zhan*” (soul), as a statement that faith enters a man as such.

In Christianity, “*faith*” is the foundation of salvation and spiritual renewal. The Apostle Paul states, “*For it is by grace you have been saved, through faith*” (Ephesians 2:8), which emphasizes the salvific function of faith and its essential role in spiritual transformation. Augustine interprets faith as complete trust in God [17], viewing it not merely as a cognitive or emotional process, but as a form of union with the divine.

In verbal communication, faith is often described using such spatial metaphors as “*qamtamasyz etu*” (to provide for), “*qorgangá alu*” (to protect), and “*beriktuğyr*” (firm foundation), emphasizing the guiding, stabilizing, and protective nature of faith. These metaphors construct faith as a means of spiritual security and orientation, which makes it closer to individuals’ psychological and social needs. The comparative cognitive and linguistic examination of the concepts of “*iman*” and “*faith*” in Islam and Christianity testifies to their great significance in religious and spiritual life. The concepts are central cognitive structures that determine the inner world, spiritual growth, and attitude towards God. Linguistic, cognitive, and cultural expressions of the four key concepts — “*God*”, “*spirit*”, “*sin*”, and “*faith*” — in Muslim and Christian contexts are the cognitive structure of religion below and the

linguistic structure of religious experience. Theolinguistics analyzes the meaning and application of the concepts within religious language, and cognitive linguistics analyzes their conceptual schemas and metaphors. For instance, the phrase “*ruh ürleu*” (to breathe in the spirit) from the Qur’an (32:9) is a cognitive metaphor that signifies the divine origin of human spiritual life, portraying this breath as the transmission of life energy. Similarly, the Christian doctrine of the Trinity represents a complex cognitive integration that is conveyed through specific linguistic forms and discursive structures at both linguistic and cultural levels [17]. Hence, theolinguistics and cognitive linguistics give a profound semantics, pragmatics, and discursive dynamics conceptualization of Islamic and Christian religious concepts, disclosing their spiritual significance and linguistic structure. Finally, the results validate that religious concepts are symbolized based on the cognitive, cultural, and historical characteristics of every linguistic group. In the Kazakh language, religious ideas are thought of primarily on a spiritual-emotional and experiential level, whereas in the English language are theological, dogmatic, and rational models prevail. These observations reflect essential characteristics of the interconnection between religious language and culture in the fields of theolinguistics and intercultural cognitive linguistics. Research in this field is key to revealing religiosities, worldviews, and cultural values through words and opening the way to an integral comprehension of religious thought through comparative study of their linguocultural articulations in various discourses.

This research reveals previously underexplored cognitive and metaphorical patterns within Kazakh and English religious discourse. Its novelty lies in the application of theolinguistics and cognitive linguistics to a comparative conceptual analysis of “God”, “Spirit”, “Sin”, and “Faith” across two distinct cultures. However, the study is limited to canonical religious texts and traditional interpretations. Future studies may include contemporary discourse and expand the linguistic range to other world religions for broader generalizability.

CONCLUSION

The theolinguistic and cognitive linguistic analysis conducted in this study has demonstrated that the linguistic and conceptual representations of the core religious concepts — *God*, *spirit*, *sin*, and *faith* — in Islam and Christianity are closely tied to the respective worldview, cultural, and religious frameworks of each tradition. The Kazakh and English religious discourses utilize different linguistic mechanisms and cognitive models to encode their articulations of these concepts. For example, Islamic discourse articulates concepts such as Allah and *ruh* (spirit) through metaphors of transcendence and spiritual purity, whereas Christian discourse articulates the Trinity and the Holy Spirit through elaborate discursive constructions.

Though there are congruences in the linguistic expression of these concepts in the two traditions, they also have their own cultural specificities. In both traditions, religious concepts are higher-level cognitive structures that organize an individual's belief system, moral orientation, and worldview. Further, the metaphors, conceptual models, and pragmatic functions of the concepts reflect the intense involvement of language and the value system of the respective culture.

This comparative study demonstrates that theolinguistic discourse is relevant not just to linguistic theory, but to religious and intercultural communication as well. The results are relevant to translation studies, linguistic, cultural studies, confessional language semantics, and intercultural pragmatics. The research also illustrates the danger of semantic distortion in religious instruction, translation, and interpretation when the national-cultural situation is overlooked. Therefore, an analysis of the theolinguistic discourse in the corresponding cultural-religious settings is helpful for interfaith discussion and comprehension. It is also a good foundation for scientific research into the interrelation between religion and language.

REFERENCES

- 1 Lakoff G., Johnson M. *Metaphors we live by* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980).

- 2 Syzdyk R. *Sozder soileidi (Sozderdin kolddanylyuy tarikhinan) [Words Speak (From the Usage History of Words)]* (Almaty: Arys, 2004). [in Kazakh]
- 3 Mauss M. *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies* (London: Routledge, 1990). (Orig. 1923).
- 4 Khamzina M. B., Zharykova D. R. Dini diskurs poëmasy «Alpamys Batyr»: khalyqtyn rukhani beynesinin korinisi [Religious Discourse in the Poem “Alpamys Batyr”: Reflection of the People’s Spiritual Identity] (Kokshetau: Vestnik KGU imeni Sh. Ualikhanov. Seriya filologicheskaya, 2025, № 1, S. 260-274). [in Kazakh]
- 5 Orazbaeva F. S., Ryskulova A. D., Orazaliyeva E. N., Rauandina A. K. Generative-Cognitive Model of Linguistic Structure and Thought Process in the Kazakh Language (Lingua: Journal of Linguistics and Language, 2025, Vol. 3, no 1, P. 17-37).
- 6 Hesse J. Metaphors, religious language and linguistic expressibility (International Journal for Philosophy of Religion, 2023, Vol. 93, no 3, P. 239-258).
- 7 Evans V. *The Structure of Time: Language, Meaning and Temporal Cognition* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2004). <https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.248>
- 8 Kuran Karim. Khalifa Altai audarmasy [The Qur’an. Translation by Khalifa Altai] (Almaty: Arys, 2002). [in Kazakh]
- 9 Yasawi, Khoja Akhmet. *Diwani Hikmet / Qurastyrgan Zh. Aubaqir [Book of Wisdom / Compiled by Zh. Aubaqir]* (Almaty: Raritet, 2000). [in Kazakh]
- 10 *Holy Bible: New International Version* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2011).
- 11 Kaliyev G. *Til bilimi terminlerinin tusindirme sozdigi [Explanatory Dictionary of Linguistic Terms]* (Pavlodar: S. Toraygyrov Pavlodar State University, 2010). [in Kazakh]
- 12 Suleimenov A. *Kazakhtyn rukhani murasy [The Spiritual Heritage of the Kazakh People]* (Almaty: Kazakhstan, 1987). [in Kazakh]
- 13 Kövecses Z. *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction* (2nd ed.) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010). <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195385772.001.0001>
- 14 Grudem W. *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2000).
- 15 Oxford English Dictionary. *Spirited*. In *Oxford English Dictionary Online* (2023). Retrieved June 25, 2025, from <https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/183756>
- 16 Abd al-Jabbar M. *Islam teologiyasy [Islamic Theology]* (Damascus: Dar al-Fikr, 1987). [in Kazakh]
- 17 Avgustin S. *De Trinitate [On the Trinity]* (400). [in Rus./Lat.]
- 18 Ghazali A. Q. *Ihya Ulum al-Din [Revival of the Religious Sciences]* (Beirut: Dar al-Fikr, 1999). [in Arabic]

Received: 01.07.2025

Қазақ және ағылшын тілдеріндегі теоллингвистикалық дискурстың когнитивтік негіздері

З.Б. Кульманова

Мичиган мемлекеттік университеті, Ист-Лансинг, 48824, АҚШ

Бұл мақалада қазақ және ағылшын тілдеріндегі теоллингвистикалық дискурстың когнитивтік және мәдени репрезентациясы салыстырмалы-когнитивтік және дискурстық талдау әдістері негізінде зерттеледі. Теоллингвистика – тіл мен діннің өзара байланысын зерттейтін пәнаралық сала болғандықтан, ол діни ұғымдардың тілдік көріністері мен мәдени-танымдық мағыналарын анықтауға бағытталады.

Зерттеу ислам мен христиан дініндегі «Құдай», «рух», «күнә» және «иман» ұғымдарына назар аудара отырып, олардың семантикалық, метафоралық және прагматикалық сипаттарын қарастырады. Қазақ тіліндегі діни дискурста «Құдай» ұғымы трансцендентті, әділетті «Жаратушы» ретінде түсініледі және ол фольклор мен Құран

мәтіндерінде «Алла», «Хақ», «Раббы» сияқты эпитеттермен аталады. Ағылшын тіліндегі «God», «Heavenly Father», «The Lord» сияқты атауларда Құдай бейнесі адамға ұқсас, тұлғалық әрі эмоционалды түрде беріледі. Христиан теологиясындағы Үшбірлік (Троица) концептісі когнитивтік интеграцияның идеалы ретінде қабылданып, ол «мұз – су – бу» метафорасы арқылы тілдік тұрғыда да көрініс табады. Исламдық дискурста «рух» ұғымы адамның ішкі әлемінің өзегі және Құдаймен, өмірмен, сеніммен байланыстың негізі ретінде сипатталады. Христиан дінінде «Киелі рух» адам жүрегіндегі рухани жаңғырумен құдайлық жетекшіліктің қайнар көзі ретінде қарастырылады. Екі дінде де рух метафоралық тұрғыдан жарық, тыныс және энергия ұғымдарымен беріледі: бұл – өмірлік метафоралар. «Күнә» ұғымы қос дінде де ішкі тазалықтың бұзылуы мен рухани тұтастықтың жойылуын білдіретін лас, ауырлық және қараңғылық метафораларымен байланыстырылған. Христиандықта «күнә» – адам табиғатына тән рухани кесел, Құдаймен байланысты бұзатын синдром ретінде сипатталып, ұрпақтан ұрпаққа берілетін рухани дерт ретінде түсіндіріледі. Ал исламда «иман» жүрек, амал және сөз бірлігінде көрініс табатын кешенді жүйе. Діни танымда сенім – құтқарылуға негіз болатын абсолюттік наным ретінде қабылданады және ол көбіне тірек, негіз, паналау сияқты кеңістіктік сипаттамалармен беріледі.

Зерттеу нәтижелері діни ұғымдардың тілдік репрезентациясы әр мәдениет пен тілде өзіндік ерекшеліктерге ие екенін көрсетеді. Бұл теоллингвистикалық дискурсты аудару, оқыту немесе түсіндіру барысында мәдени контекст пен ұғымдардың құрылымын ескерудің маңыздылығын айқындайды.

Кілт сөздер: теоллингвистика, когнитивтік лингвистика, концепт, Құдай, рух, иман, күнә, ислам, христиандық, мәдени код.

ӘДЕБИЕТТЕР ТІЗІМІ

- 1 Lakoff G., Johnson M. *Metaphors we live by*. – Chicago, 1980. – 276 p.
- 2 Сыздық Р. *Сөздер сөйлейді (Сөздердің қолданылу тарихынан)*. – Алматы, 2004. – 296 б.
- 3 Mauss M. *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies*. – London, 1990. – 192 p.
- 4 Хамзина М. Б., Жарыкова Д. Р. Діни дискурс поэмасы «Алпамыс Батыр»: халықтың рухани бейнесінің көрінісі / М. Б. Хамзина, Д. Р. Жарыкова // Вестник КГУ имени Ш. Уәлиханов. Серия филологиялық. – 2025. – № 1. – Б. 260-274. DOI:10.59102/kufil/2025/iss1pp260-274.
- 5 Orazbaeva F. S., Ryskulova A. D., Orazaliyeva E. N., Rauandina A. K. Generative-Cognitive Model of Linguistic Structure and Thought Process in the Kazakh Language // *Lingua: Journal of Linguistics and Language*. – 2025. – Vol. 3, № 1. – P. 17-37. DOI:10.61978/lingua.v3i1.617.
- 6 Hesse J. Metaphors, religious language and linguistic expressibility // *International Journal for Philosophy of Religion*. – 2023. – Vol. 93, № 3. – P. 239-258. DOI:10.1007/s11153-023-09865-2
- 7 Evans V. *The Structure of Time: Language, Meaning and Temporal Cognition*. – Amsterdam, 2004. – 398 p. <https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.248>
- 8 Құран Кәрім. *Халифа Алтай аудармасы*. – Алматы, 2002. – 624 б.
- 9 Ясауи Қожа Ахмет. *Диуани Хикмет / Құрастырған Ж. Аубакир*. – Алматы, 2000. – 276 б.
- 10 *Holy Bible: New International Version*. – Grand Rapids, MI, 2011. – 1436 p.
- 11 Қалиев Ғ. *Тіл білімі терминдерінің түсіндірме сөздігі*. – Павлодар, 2010. – 384 б.
- 12 Сүлейменов Ә. *Қазақтың рухани мұрасы*. – Алматы, 1987. – 280 б.
- 13 Kövecses Z. *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction* (2nd ed.). – Oxford, 2010. – 392 p. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195385772.001.0001>
- 14 Grudem W. *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine*. – Grand Rapids, MI, 2000. – 1290 p.
- 15 *Oxford English Dictionary. Spirited*. In *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. – 2023. Retrieved June 25, 2025, from <https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/183756>

- 16 Абд әл-Жаббар М. *Ислам теологиясы*. – Дамаск, 1987. – 318 б.
- 17 Августин С. *Үйбірлік туралы*. – 400.
- 18 Ghazali A. Q. *Ihya Ulum al-Din*. – Beirut, 1999. – 600 p.

Материал 01.07.2025 баспаға түсті

Когнитивные основы теолингвистического дискурса на казахском и английском языках

З.Б. Кульманова

Мичиганский государственный университет, Ист-Лансинг, 48824, США

Данная работа исследует когнитивное и культурное представление теолингвистического дискурса в казахском и английском языках на основе сравнительно-когнитивного и дискурсивного анализа. Теолингвистика — это междисциплинарная область, изучающая взаимосвязь религии и языка, необходимая для выявления языковых репрезентаций и культурно-когнитивных значений религиозных понятий.

Исследование сосредоточено на центральных исламских и христианских понятиях «Бог», «дух», «грех» и «иман» (вера), рассматривая их семантические, метафорические и прагматические свойства. В казахском религиозном языке «Бог» концептуализируется как трансцендентный, праведный «Создатель» и именуется эпитетами, такими как «Алла», «Хак» и «Рабби» в фольклоре и коранической литературе. В английском языке используются титулы «God», «Heavenly Father» и «The Lord» с более антропоморфным оттенком, подчеркивающим личное и эмоциональное вовлечение. Троица в христианской теологии рассматривается как идеал когнитивной интеграции и вербально выражается через метафоры «лед – вода – пар». В исламском дискурсе концепция «рух» (дух) понимается как ядро внутреннего мира человека и основа связи с Богом, жизнью и верой. В христианстве «Святой Дух» описывается как источник духовного обновления и божественного наставления в сердце верующего. Дух в обеих религиях метафорически ассоциируется со светом, дыханием и энергией — метафорами жизни. Понятие «грех» в обеих религиях связано с метафорами грязи, тяжести и тьмы, символизирующими осквернение внутренней святости и духовной целостности. В христианстве «грех» представлен как духовная болезнь человеческой природы, синдром, разрушающий отношения с Богом и передающийся из поколения в поколение. «Иман» (вера) в исламе — это комплексная система, проявляющаяся через единство сердца, поступков и речи. В религиозном мышлении вера рассматривается как абсолютное убеждение, лежащее в основе спасения, и часто описывается пространственными метафорами опоры, основания и убежища.

Результаты показывают характерные особенности языкового представления религиозных концептов в различных культурах и языках, что открывает новые возможности для интерпретации теолингвистического дискурса. Это подчеркивает важность учета культурного контекста и организации понятий при переводе, преподавании или объяснении религиозных текстов.

Ключевые слова: теолингвистика, когнитивная лингвистика, концепт, Бог, дух, вера, грех, ислам, христианство, культурный код.

СПИСОК ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ

- 1 Lakoff G., Johnson M. *Metaphors we live by*. – Chicago, 1980. – 276 p.
- 2 Сыздық Р. *Слова говорят (Из истории употребления слов)*. – Алматы, 2004. – 296 с.
- 3 Mauss M. *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies*. – London, 1990. – 192 p.

- 4 Хамзина М. Б., Жарыкова Д. Р. Религиозный дискурс в поэме «Алпамыс батыр»: отражение духовного образа народа // *Вестник КГУ имени Ш. Уәлиханов. Серия филологическая*. – 2025. – № 1. – С. 260-274. DOI:10.59102/kufil/2025/iss1pp260-274.
- 5 Orazbaeva F. S., Ryskulova A. D., Orazaliyeva E. N., Rauandina A. K. Generative-Cognitive Model of Linguistic Structure and Thought Process in the Kazakh Language // *Lingua: Journal of Linguistics and Language*. – 2025. – Vol. 3, № 1. – P. 17-37. DOI:10.61978/lingua.v3i1.617.
- 6 Hesse J. Metaphors, religious language and linguistic expressibility // *International Journal for Philosophy of Religion*. – 2023. – Vol. 93, № 3. – P. 239-258. DOI:10.1007/s11153-023-09865-2
- 7 Evans V. *The Structure of Time: Language, Meaning and Temporal Cognition*. – Amsterdam, 2004. – 398 p. <https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.248>
- 8 Коран. *Перевод Халифа Алтай*. – Алматы, 2002. – 624 с.
- 9 Ясави Ходжа Ахмет. *Диуани Хикмет* / Составил Ж. Аубакир. – Алматы, 2000. – 276 с.
- 10 *Holy Bible: New International Version*. – Grand Rapids, MI, 2011. – 1436 p.
- 11 Калиев Г. *Толковый словарь терминов по лингвистике*. – Павлодар, 2010. – 384 с.
- 12 Сулейменов А. *Духовное наследие казахского народа*. – Алматы, 1987. – 280 с.
- 13 Kövecses Z. *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction* (2nd ed.). – Oxford, 2010. – 392 p. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195385772.001.0001>
- 14 Grudem W. *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine*. – Grand Rapids, MI, 2000. – 1290 p.
- 15 *Oxford English Dictionary. Spirited*. In *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. – 2023. Retrieved June 25, 2025, from <https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/183756>
- 16 Абд аль-Джаббар М. *Исламская теология*. – Дамаск, 1987. – 318 с.
- 17 Августин С. *О Троице*. – 400.
- 18 Ghazali A. Q. *Ihya Ulum al-Din*. – Beirut, 1999. – 600 p.

Материал поступил в редакцию журнала 01.07.2025

IRTSI 16.01.33

DOI: [10.59102/kufil/2025/iss3pp73-82](https://doi.org/10.59102/kufil/2025/iss3pp73-82)

N.K. Kypshakbay

Korkyt Ata Kyzylorda University, Kyzylorda, 120014, Kazakhstan

ANALYZING THE LINGUISTIC DEVELOPMENT OF KAZAKH: WORD BORROWING VIA SOCIAL NETWORK

The current study explores the influence of loanwords originating from social networks on the Kazakh language. A quantitative method was employed to examine the usage of borrowed words from social networks. A questionnaire distributed to 323 participants gathered data on social media usage and word borrowings. The data was analyzed using the SPSS (Statistical Program for Social Sciences) software. Findings suggest a recent surge in the adoption of social media loanwords, particularly among younger demographics, shaping online communication norms and impacting Kazakh language development. These loanwords often serve as vehicles for expressing contemporary concepts that are not easily translated into traditional Kazakh vocabulary. The study emphasizes the importance of further research into incorporating social media loanwords in Kazakh communication, given the growing significance of digital language in daily life. Understanding the impact of word borrowings on language and culture can aid in navigating linguistic evolution in the digital era in Kazakhstan.

Key words: loanwords, word borrowings, social network, linguistic evolution, digital age, SPSS program, quantitative method.