

IRSTI 16.21.27

DOI:10.59102/kufil/2026/iss1pp182-197

D. Suleimen¹, A. Salkynbay¹

¹Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, 050040, Kazakhstan

A PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF NEGATIVE POLITENESS STRATEGIES IN KAZAKH

This study presents a pragmatic analysis of negative politeness strategies in the Kazakh language, based on Brown and Levinson's politeness category theory as its theoretical basis. Negative politeness refers to communicative strategies aimed at minimizing intrusiveness, maintaining social distance, and respecting the interlocutor's autonomy, which are collectively known as the preservation of negative face. In the Kazakh discourse, these strategies are closely connected to culturally embedded norms of hierarchy, respect for age and status, and indirectness, all of which are central to regulating interpersonal communication.

The main objective of this study is to identify, classify, and interpret negative politeness strategies used in contemporary Kazakh discourse. The analysis demonstrates that negative politeness in Kazakh goes beyond universal pragmatic patterns, reflecting specific linguistic realizations shaped by traditional values, social structures, and communicative expectations. Special attention is given to the ways in which speakers mitigate face-threatening acts in contexts such as refusals, requests, advice, and institutional interactions.

This study uses a mixed-methods approach, integrating and combining both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. Data were sourced from naturally occurring spoken interactions in the Almaty region. The analysis uses Brown and Levinson's classification of negative politeness strategies, including indirectness, hedging, being pessimistic, apologizing, minimizing imposition, showing deference, impersonalizing both speaker and hearer, stating FTA and naminalizing. Each case is analyzed within its context to elucidate pragmatic functions and sociocultural motivations.

The findings indicate that negative politeness strategies in Kazakh are especially noticeable in linguistic devices, such as modal constructions, honorific forms, lexical softeners, formulaic expressions, and syntactic distancing. These strategies are especially prominent in asymmetric communicative situations characterized by differences in age, social status, or institutional roles. The analysis shows that Kazakh speakers often prefer indirect and deferential forms of expression to minimize imposition, thereby promoting social harmony and mutual respect.

Key words: politeness category, Kazakh language, pragmatics, communication, culture.

MAIN PROVISIONS

Politeness rules show informal guidelines shaped by societal needs, customs, beliefs, and judgments. In the Kazakh dictionary, politeness is given as “courtesy, respectability, no trickery, simplicity” [1: 763]. Behaviors, whether verbal or non-verbal, that are desired in specific situations in daily life are often characterized as polite or respectful. Conversely, expressions that exceed the boundaries of acceptable behavior are deemed disrespectful or rude. Kazimierz Ożóg explains that the role and function of rules in relation and value systems are to facilitate direct interactions that enable individuals to show their objectives and safeguard their positions within society and groups [2]. In this context, the norms of politeness exhibit a socially binding nature, and individuals acquire these unwritten behavioral rules through their social experiences. Each group in society possesses its own set of behaviors regarded as polite and respectful, yet these behaviors vary across different groups. Brown and Levinson [3: 187] examine an example from their study of language use among Harijans, as known the lowest social class in India. They observed that a Harijan who had been reprimanded by his master would laugh like an English child, feign difficulty understanding instructions, mumble, and produce incomplete sentences. This showed shame in expressing ideas

perceived as unintelligent. This research illustrates how linguistic behavior can reflect the balance of power between interlocutors.

Individuals are expected to adhere to these rules within their social circles. Adherence to these guidelines enables individuals to earn respect and maintain their dignity within society. Kazimierz Ożóg [2: 79] explains the politeness model as “[...] a system of rules and norms endorsed and widely accepted within a particular community (group, society), outlining an acceptable manner of interaction among its members, which can also be expressed verbally. In society, it manifests as either polite and cultured behavior or as rude conduct.”

In addition to the studies mentioned above, behavior that is considered polite in one society can also be expressed in other groups of societies through cultural interactions. Nowadays, like in western society giving priority to women in Kazakh society took place, e.g., letting ladies pass through the door first or ‘ladies first’. In addition to this, what is considered polite in different social circles within the same society may differ. On the other hand, similar situations can be observed in terms of the representation of behavior patterns in the language. In other words, a form of politeness can be transferred to another language or from one social class to another through translation and copy.

BLPCS was evaluated and studied from the perspective of the Kazakh language. According to Brown and Levinson, their politeness theory is universal and the strategies mentioned in it can be seen in all languages also in Kazakh too. While developing their theory, Brown and Levinson believed that the English language reflected the characteristics of unrelated and distant cultures. English, Tzeltal and Tamil were studied comparatively. They tried to prove the universality of their model by showing that there are some common uses in these three languages that they defined within politeness. All aspects of the languages under consideration in BLPCS have been studied, and thus definitions of written and spoken languages have been provided in our study.

To address the question of how politeness rules are represented in language has become the main question of recent research, we can say that the study was carried out within the framework of the theoretical approaches of pragmatics, especially during the last forty years. The study focuses on the expression of politeness in the current dynamic change and development of Kazakh, especially in the colloquial speech.

INTRODUCTION

Politeness: Some Universals in Language Use, a reputational defense study by Brown and Levinson [3], is the most thorough analysis and study of politeness discourse. One of the most influential theoretical frameworks for studying politeness is the model proposed by Brown and Levinson, often referred to as the Brown and Levinson Politeness Category System (BLPCS). This model explains how speakers use different communicative strategies in order to mitigate face-threatening acts and maintain social harmony in interaction. Brown and Levinson discovered that Tamil, English, and Tzeltal, a Mayan language spoken in southern Mexico and southern India, share similarities in their structures pertaining to politeness. BLPCS is described as a face-saving theory by Fraser [4]. Grice's cooperative principle and Goffman's definition of authority are typically the foundations of BLPCS. Contrary to what Lakoff and Leach previously believed, Brown and Levinson [3] integrate Grice's cooperative principles into their theory of politeness and concentrate on departures from rational utility and efficiency in communication. As a result, when an attitude that deviates from Grice's cooperative principles is seen, linguistic civility is necessary [5]. To put it another way, politeness in language arises from a departure from rational efficiency in communication, and this can be kindly explained. Language does not deviate from rational efficiency for no reason. In contrast to Leach and Lakoff, Brown and Levinson [3], he centers his theory around the idea of authority, which was first identified by sociologist Goffman, rather than adding new principles to Grice's principles of cooperation. According to Goffman [6: 5], reputation is "the positive social value that an individual successfully offers for himself in a particular relational situation." According to Locher [7:52], Goffmann defined reputation as "the self-image that another individual gives to himself during a certain interaction, and it is like a mask." This implies that

depending on the situation, a person may have multiple distinct images or masks. To explain their theory, Brown and Levinson [3:46] created a model personality (MP) that they believed represented S(speaker) and H(hearer). As a result, MP is capable of selecting the best strategy to accomplish communicative objectives. Simultaneously, the MP is responsible for assessing the risk to the other participant's reputation and selecting a suitable plan to curb the defamatory behavior, which may involve targeted actions. The individual has both local and distant reputations. According to Brown and Levinson [3:59], these ideas are defined as follows.

Negative face: It includes rights related to personal space, freedom of action and freedom to refuse requests. In other words, the wearer of this pattern does not want his actions to be restricted or hindered by others.

Positive face: a coherent positive image that results from people's desire to be valued and accepted, at least by others. MP has a reputation near and far.

Because they require their actual authority, participants try to be cooperative, emphasize solidarity, and exhibit authenticity. Conversely, the ability to act on one's own initiative and decline requests is known as exclusive authority. The participants used the terms approach and distance strategies rather than positive and negative kindness strategies, and they placed a strong emphasis on social balances like power and distance that take prestige needs into account. As a result, they view communication as potentially hazardous and incompatible with Brown and Levinson's BLPCS concepts. Simultaneously, Brown and Levinson [3: 60–62] noted that individuals have distinct communication needs and may experience verbal communication difficulties based on their unique characteristics. They described these behaviors as face-to-face attempts. FTA (Face-threatening Act) is an act that alienates and jeopardizes S or H's needs for prestige.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The primary research question of this study is which linguistic units in the Kazakh language realize the category of politeness and what their socio-communicative functions are. Anthropocentric research in Kazakh linguistics is particularly relevant to this issue, as the concept of politeness reflects not only linguistic forms but also broader social norms and cultural traditions. Therefore, the research question requires a comprehensive examination of the various manifestations of politeness in Kazakh discourse.

The empirical data for this study were collected from naturally occurring spoken interactions in the Almaty region between January and September 2025. The dataset includes approximately 120 examples illustrating the use of negative politeness strategies in Kazakh discourse. Due to the journal's formatting requirements and limitations on article length, only a selected number of representative examples are presented in the article. The data were obtained from several sources, including everyday conversational speech, interview fragments, media discourse, fictional dialogues, and official discourse samples such as government documents and reports that reflect patterns of spoken language. These materials were selected to represent different communicative situations in which politeness strategies typically occur. The materials were organized both stylistically and thematically. The selection of examples was based on several criteria: the presence of a face-threatening act (FTA) such as a request, refusal, advice, or criticism; the use of linguistic devices that mitigate the potential imposition on the interlocutor; and the relevance of the example to one of Brown and Levinson's negative politeness strategies.

Each example was analyzed within its pragmatic context, taking into account factors such as social distance, power relations, and communicative intention. The analysis combines qualitative interpretation of the communicative functions of politeness strategies with quantitative observation of their distribution in the dataset. Such an approach makes it possible to identify the linguistic realizations of politeness strategies and reveal their sociocultural motivations in Kazakh communication.

The descriptive method was used to identify words and grammatical forms expressing politeness, and their use was examined in specific communicative contexts. In addition, the politeness

category in the Kazakh language was compared with similar phenomena in other Turkic languages and cultural traditions in order to reveal its national and cultural characteristics. The use of politeness units was considered in specific contexts, and their meanings and communicative functions were determined. From a methodological perspective, the combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches allowed for a more comprehensive analysis of politeness strategies in Kazakh discourse. The reliability of the study's findings was ensured through the diversity of the collected materials, their systematic organization, and contextual pragmatic analysis.

RESULTS

The examples collected in this study relate to different categories of negative politeness strategies:

1. Be conventionally indirect (Strategy 1)

The analysis of the studied texts shows that indirect structures created in different ways are used to mitigate the impact of face-threatening acts (FTAs). In BLPCS, these structures provide the hearer with indirect means in communicating requests and offers, as well as in rejecting them. In this way, The Hearer's negative face is mitigated by strict demands and harsh criticism. In the following example (1) you can see the difference between simple and predicate-explicit, as well as the transformation between command/request:

*(1) Ал енді сен түсіндір... содан кейін сен де айтарсың.
Now it's your turn to explain... then you will spill it out.*

In this example (1), the speaker has two interlocutors, both of whom ask the speaker to explain the situation from their point of view. In this case, The Speaker uses a more direct form when addressing the first interlocutor, because he wants to fulfill the interlocutor's request. Since the interlocutor's interest is at a high level, he does not use any reparative action, taking into account the sincerity between them. However, the situation is not the same for the second addressee. Speaker in this case makes an indirect speech act. In fact, both utterances are clear, but in the first mitigating strategy (which may be indirect) is not used, while in the second the indirect word is preferred. Indirect speech acts like (1) in the above example, for example, you will later say, would not be correct if there was an inequality of power and distance between people. In BLPCS, such uses are considered indirect speech, but only with appreciative politeness. It is said that they can be evaluated [3:142]. In our study, the above examples of "You'll tell me later" were treated with careful courtesy based on this information.

2. Question, hedge (Strategy 2)

Brown and Levinson (1987) discuss hedging expressions mainly under the following headings: (i) illusory power constraints, (ii) divisors encoded in fractions, and (iii) divisors under Grice's cooperation principle. They say that the most frequently used words in the language are hedges, but these words do not enter dictionaries and are theoretically ignored. Then, based on the examples they identified from Celta, they divide particles and lexical separators into intensifiers (emphasis separators that act exactly or as if they were precise) and attenuators (those that soften or obscure what is being described).

Hedges in the analyzed texts are presented in different groups based on Fraser's [10] classification and definitions, with BLPCS discussed in detail in the theoretical framework.

In the examples below, it can be seen that thinking and predicting activities, which Fraser [10] identifies as cognitive activities in his classification, make the Speaker's utterance more subjective. The uses considered in this group are those of Grice seen in the context of the principles of cooperation, it is related to the principle of quality because it gives the impression that S does not want to take full responsibility for the correctness of his speech:

(2) S1: Қанишалықты оңай жұмыс. Қолға күрек ұстамасаң, қалай? Талант, білім мен еңбек керек. Бар ма сенде?

What an easy job. Why you don't want to work? Do you have talent, knowledge and hard work for it?

S2: *Жоқ, бар деп ойламаймын...*

No, I don't think I have...

(3) *Мен де ештеңе болады деп ойламаймын, бірақ күте тұрыңыз...*

I don't think anything will happen either, but wait...

(4) *Серік, менің ойымыа, бұның шипасын табамыз.. Енді врач емесіз бірақ бос отырмаймыз ғой.*

Serik, I think we will find a cure for this. We are not doctors, but we are not lazy people.

(5) *Менің ойымыа, тарих пәні мұғалімінің ұлы бұл мәселеге біршама сабырлы болуы мүмкін.*

I think that the son of a history teacher can be a little calmer on this matter.

(2) S1, answering the question, hesitated his statement with the help of the verb "I think". (3) S avoided expressing his opinion openly with the verb "I don't think".

3. Be Pessimistic (Strategy 3)

Another strategy related to the strategy of indirectness in BLPCS is being pessimistic, which reflects the Speaker's intention to avoid imposing on the hearer. Examples of the pessimistic strategy identified in the analyzed texts are given below with their explanation:

(6) *Шынар, пирог та жейтін бе едің?*

Would you like to eat plantain and pie?

(7) *Мынаны алар ма едіңіз?*

Would you have this?

The pessimistic strategy is seen in these two examples, and we have also seen it in the strategy of being indirect. According to BLPCS, questions like "Do you want" have effects that take the sentence into the hypothetical world, and the complementary element of these effects are conditional sentences. In this case, from the examples we have given (7), it can be thought that I am asking you if you want something.

(8) S1: *Сұрайын деп едім. Сұрай алмадым.*

I wanted to ask. I could not ask.

S2: *Ау...тортты ұмыттық па?*

Oh...did we forget the cake?

C1: *ойбуйй... ұмыттым.*

I don't know ... I forgot.

(9) S1: *Анар?*

Anar?

S2: *Ау, не болды?*

Oh, what happened?

S1: *Мен бірдеңе айтайын деп едім... жарайды... бұл орынсыз болар..*

I was going to say something... ok ... maybe that's inappropriate..

In the above example (8), S1 uses "I was going to ask" instead of "if you don't mind, I had a question/I had something to say". The same situation can be seen in example (9). S1 starts right away instead of asking for permission to say what's on his mind. I ask my question without permission.

4. Minimize the imposition, Rx (Strategy 4)

It was found that the strategy of minimizing imposition was frequently used in the studied texts as a way of making the irrelevant. As stated in the theoretical framework, this strategy shows that S preserves the relationship between H and distance and power on the one hand, and on the other hand shows the triviality of the application. This is achieved through the use of minimizing expressions.

In the texts reviewed for this strategy, it was found that the expressions such as "a little", "slightly", and "a bit" are often used as a means of loading the imposition:

(10) *Анай, мен кварплата алып келдім. Айыпқа бұйырмаңызшы, мен сәл кешіктірдім. Сізге айтқанымдай, ауруханада жаттым, емделдім...*

Aunty, I brought the rent payment. Please don't blame me, I'm a little late. As I told you, I was in the hospital, I was treated...

(11) *Бұл да уайымдайтын дүние емес. Сол бір ұсақ-түйек жұмыспен айналысқаниша денсаулығыңа қарасаңшы. Шамалы демал. Өзіңе қара.*

This is not a world to worry about. Take care of your health before you do that little job. Get some rest. Look at yourself.

(12) *Сәл батыл болсаңшы мұндайда. Алға!*

Be a little braver in this case. Go ahead!

(13) *Осы тойда жүргендерге қарасам, біртүрлі. Сәл іштей наразы сияқты көрінді ме маған. Не знаю, в общем, өтті зой құдалық.*

It's strange when I look at the people at this wedding. It seemed to me that he was a little dissatisfied. I don't know, in general, the engagement is over.

(14) *Мынасы зілдей зой. Көтере алмаспыз. Отағасы шамалы көмектесіңіз бос тұрмай.*

This is like a joke. We can't raise it. Help the head of the family, don't be idle.

In (10) of the above examples, S used the word sparingly to downplay the embarrassment caused by late rent. Similarly, in (11) and (12) when giving advice to H, in (13) when criticizing, in (14) when making a request, it can be seen that the words "slightly" and "slightly" are used as a means of discrimination.

5. Give deference (Strategy 5)

This section discusses the manifestations of respect as a politeness strategy in the form of matching, using you/you, elevating the other party, and self-humbling expressions, as stated in the theoretical framework. Address forms in the analyzed texts are divided into two according to the addressee's relative and remote authority requirements, as mentioned in the politeness section. In resorting to forms based on the purpose of honoring, S shows that he considers H's distant reputation. In addition, these forms of forms of address reflect social variables of social variables such as power, distance, gender between S and H. In the reviewed texts, it was found that the forms of address expressing respect are in the following structures:

a. name + honorary title: Mr. Yerlan, Ms. Aigul, Ms. Elmira, Ms. Aidana, Mr. Rinat, Ms. Anar, Mr. Edyl

b. name + professional title: Aunt Raushan, Uncle Iskender, Aunt Maryam (for teachers, the word "aunt" is used instead of "teacher"), teacher Burhan, teacher Yerlan

c. honorific + participle: my lord

d. honorific title: Mr., Mrs

h. professional name + participle: my teacher, my teacher, my aunt, my brother

i. Profession: boss, doctor

An example of each of the analyzed texts related to the forms of addressing in this classification is given below with their explanation:

(15) S1: *Не болды, Лияс ағай?*

What happened, Uncle Liyas?

S2: *ремонт дауысы сабақ өткізбеді.*

The noise from construction disturbed our class.

(16) S1: *Осы районға дүкен жетіспейді екен. Дүкен ашпадыңыз ба, Мұрат аға?*

There is a lack of shops in this district. Didn't you open a shop, brother Murat?

S2: *Қай ақшама ашамын, дәрігер мырза?*

What kind of money that I can afford to pay, Mr. Doctor?

(17) S1: *Олар сені шақырады... Күте тұр...*

They call you... Wait...

S2: *Охо, мырзам, енді сенің айтқаныңмен жүреміз бе?*

Oh, sir, shall we follow your instructions?

(18) S1: *Сіздің атыңыз кім, ханым?*

What's your name, ma'am?

(19) *Бәрін тексеріп шығу керек шығар, жай отырмай тексере берейік. Нұрлан ұстаз, ойланьп кетінсіз ғой?*

Maybe we should check everything, let's check it without sitting down. Teacher Nurlan, have you thought about it?

(20) *Дариға апай, диктантқа қандай баға қойдыңыз?*

Aunt Dariga, how did you rate the dictation?

(21) *Ұстазым менің, ұстазым! Жаным, апай, сағынып кеттім ғой сізді.*

My teacher, my teacher! My dear, aunt, I miss you.

(22) *Айналайын, дәрігер, мынаның емі бар ма?*

Come on, doctor, is there a cure for this?

(23) *Сіз маған Қаламқас апайға звонда деп едіңіз.*

You told me to call Aunt Kalamkas.

6. Apologize (Strategy 6)

In the analyzed texts, it was observed that the apology strategy was used in situations where The Hearer's negative face was threatened. This section analyzes findings related to apology strategy under the themes of acknowledging the imposition, expressing reluctance, presenting strong reasons, and apologizing in BLPCS. In addition, this section emphasizes apologetic forms in situations where S makes a request to or criticizes H by following the BLPCS. Below is an example of a specific act of apologizing for S's past behavior (372). Similar examples are discussed further at the end of the chapter:

(24) *Мақпал тәте, кешіріңіз, бірақ мен қақпаны қатты ұрдым, ешкім ашпады*

Aunt Makpal, I'm sorry, but I knocked on the gate so hard, no one opened it.

A true apology can be seen in the example above (24). Before entering the house, S knocked on the gate, entered when no one answered, threatened the lady of the house whom he met by chance, and apologized for this situation. When this example is evaluated from the perspective of Speech Act Theory, it is seen that there is no condition of negative event constituting the propositional content of the act of apology.

(25) *Негізі қалауым басқа. Бізде айлық аз, адам еңбегіне мән бермейді ғой. Мен сияқты квартира жағалап жүргенін қаламаймын. Мына олжаны жібергім келмейді. Әй, Санжар, өзіңнен үмітім зор. Бір көмегіңді күтемін.*

Actually I want something else. We don't have much salary, people don't care about labor. I don't want you to rent a flat like me. I don't want to let go of this loot. Oh, Sanjar, I have high hopes for you. I am waiting for your help.

In the above example (25), S's marking of his request as a large service is related to the perception of an exceeded threshold in the BLPCS. Thus, S conveys that he knows that his request has the potential to threaten H's reputation, and that he accepts this situation from the outset. Second, examples of cases of reluctance are given below:

(26) *Осы компанияға келгенімде маман аз еді, қазір көп. Ол кездегі атмосфераны айтып жеткізе алмаймын. Новый год сияқты корпоративтер жақсы тойланатын. Еее, заман басқа ғой. Өткенді айтып несіне басыңды ауыртамын.*

When I came to this company, there were few specialists, now there are many. I cannot describe the atmosphere at that time. The corporates like New Year were well celebrated. Well, times are different. Why bother talking about the past?

7. Impersonalize S and H (Strategy 7)

S and H in BLPCS Regarding the strategy of impersonalization, firstly, it is aimed at removing the subject and indirect objects of the performance actions, and it was said that this may be the result of avoiding the use of the pronouns I and you. In this regard, it is argued that example (1) given in the BLPCS is not traditional, and instead (2) is more appropriate:

1. I tell you that it is so.

2. It is so.

In the studied texts, there are very few examples that confirm this information given in BLPCS, such as (from you), I (from you), I ask (from you), I (to you), I tell (to you). In the few examples where the active verbs are used, two main cases have been identified. The first of these is the case where S repeats a word that the addressee has not heard; The second one reminds the addressee of S's previous speech, threatens and warns.

(27) S1: *Еш айыбы жоқ. Кедергі келтірмедің зой. Не жаңалық?*

There is nothing wrong. You did not interfere. What's new?

S2: *ау?*

Huh?

S1: *Не жаңалық деп жатырмын.*

What's new?

(28) *Ой, айтқанды түсінбедің зой. Блин, енді қайттым?! Келетін адамдар бар еді деп тұрмын зой. Айтқанымды естімедің.*

Oh, you didn't understand what I said. Damn, I'm back now?! I mean there were people coming. You didn't hear what I said.

(29) S1: *Балам, қалтаңа салып қой пышақты.*

Son, put the knife in your pocket.

S2: *Неге?*

Why?

S1: *Өзіңді жарақаттап аласың деп тұрмын саған.*

I am telling you that you will injure yourself.

As with the examples above for orders, the categories of person and number are coded by the FTA in action types, and the elements that complement the action are omitted from the utterance.

(30) S1: *Айнұра, сен не істеп жатырсың?*

Ainura, what are you doing?

S2: *Мешать етпеші*

Don't interfere

(31) S1: *Балам, сен қазақсың ба?*

My son, are you Kazakh?

S2: *Иә, ағай.*

Yes, uncle.

S1: *Бәйтерекке қалай барсам болады?*

How can I go to Baiterek?

S1: *Былай жүресіз. Көрсетейін.*

This way. Let me show you.

(32) S1: *Сен... өй, сен ... Мұраттың ұлы емесің бе?*

You... are n't you... Murat's son?

S2: *Не болды?*

What happened?

(33) S1: *Ұстаз, бұл бала... Мектепті енді ғана бітірді...*

Teacher, this boy... He just graduated from the school...

S2: *Ханым, үндемеңіз!*

Lady, shut up!

(34) S1: *Білесіз бе, бірақ мырза, мен не айтамын, ол енді бала емес...*

You know, but sir, what can I say, he is no longer a child...

S2: *Бекболат, қойыңызшы былжырамай. Тыңдайды да.*

Bekbolat, please don't tumble. He would listen.

In the examples given above, sentences (30), (31) and (32) are made in the second person, showing the actions as imperative and rude. In examples (33) and (34), it can be seen that S uses the pronoun you to strengthen the command, although he uses honorific words such as Ms. and Mr. As explained in the theoretical framework, another result of this strategy is impersonal actions, as mentioned in the BLPCS. As with the examples above for orders, the categories of person and number

are coded by the FTA in action types, and the elements that complement the action are omitted from the utterance.

8. State the FTA as a general rule (Strategy 8)

According to the BLPCS, the strategy of expressing the FTA as a general rule in negative politeness stems from S and H's desire to formulate the FTA as a set of general social rules, regulations, and obligations to avoid oppression within a particular FTA determined from the analyzed texts.

(35) *Жаным, ақша – қолдың кірі.*

My dear, money is dirty.

(36) *Құдай қонақ қой. Қалай кет дейсіз? Дей алмайсыз. Бір ретін табайық.*

Guest is the God. How would you send them away? You can't say. Let's find a time.

(37) *Еркек адам әйелдің ісіне араласпайды. Не жұмысыңыз бар?*

A man does not interfere in a woman's affairs. What is your job?

(38) *Ой, көрші, қанеки. Темірді қызған кезінде соғады. Бастап жіберсей*

Oh, come on, come on. It is better for him to strike the iron while it is still hot. Let's start.

(39) *Махаббаттың шегі болмайды. Ел айта береді, ал сен жүрегіңе сен.*

Love has no limits. The people keep telling you, and you believe in your heart.

In the above-mentioned examples (35), S, who was criticized due to his wife's financial situation and poor profession, tried to calm his wife down and used the popular saying "money is dirt on the hands". In (36), S asks his wife to welcome the guests with whom they quarreled earlier and not cause any trouble. In delivering this request, he delivered the FTA as a general rule, taking into account the demands of his addressee's distant reputation. In (37), S, warning a friend, used an intrusive expression commonly used for the male, female part. At S2 (38), giving advice to Dos, he used the proverb "One strikes when the iron is hot" as a means of making the FTA a general rule, and then expressed his opinion as a general rule with the words "You should not waste time".

Finally (39), S2 states that he disagrees with the addressee's opinion and turns his opinion into a general rule. Based on the examples identified in the analyzed texts, it was found that, as a general rule, the present tense is used in the strategy of expressing the S1, and proverbs, aphorisms or expressions that are often used by the public are used in the expression of the S1.

9. Nominalize (Strategy 9)

Another strategy to consider in the courtesy of BLPCS is nominalization. As presented in the theoretical framework, Brown and Levinson evaluate nominalization in terms of two features of politeness. First, they point out that nominalization creates a formal language structure. Second, they focus on the nominalization function to reduce the force of the verb. They argue that because of these two features, nominalization is used as a polite tool to reduce the impact of FTA. In Turkish, verbs easily change to nouns, adjectives, and adverbs by adopting certain morphemes. Thus, it allows you to create long sentences, especially in written language. In short, nomenclature is used in Turkish not only to create a formal language or to avoid imposition. This section discusses examples of nomenclature that may be considered courtesy of BLPCS.

In the analyzed examples, the suffixes ar, er, r are added to the verb and formed by the word "no". In this way, it can be seen that negative verb sentences turn into negative noun sentences, and in these structures, the category of person is not completely destroyed, but it is partially removed from the sword verb:

(40) *Ештеңе ...айтарым жоқ.*

I have nothing to say.

(41) *Ау, айта бер ойыңа келгенді. Барарым жоқ.*

Oh, tell me what's on your mind. I don't want to go.

(42) *Көгерім жоқ. Көңілім қалды. Қаншама күттім. Абаяда қанша сағат тұрдым.*

I have no idea. I was disappointed. I waited so long. How many hours did I stay in the abaya ?

(43) *Алып-қосарым жоқ. Өзің білесің, айта бер.*

I don't have anything to add. You know, tell me.

(44) Ештеңе айтпаймын. Айтарым жоқ себебі. Не айтайын?

I won't say anything. I have no reason to say. What can I say?

As in the above examples, it can be seen that in the mentioned passives the element of person is removed, and at the same time the reference to persons is removed. For this reason, such uses identified from the analyzed texts are S and H both in the nominalization strategy also indicated in the indices given in the depersonalization strategy.

As in the above examples, it can be seen that in the mentioned passives the element of person is removed, and at the same time the reference to persons is removed. For this reason, such uses identified from the analyzed texts are S and H both in the nominalization strategy also indicated in the indices given in the depersonalization strategy.

Brown and Levinson's [3:208] two usages intuitively suggest that the more an expression is named, the further away it is from acting, feeling, or being a thing; instead of being the referent of the verb, the verb becomes an attribute of the action (such as an adjective).

10. Go on record as incurring a debt, or as not incurring H (Strategy 10)

In BLPCS, this strategy involves expressing gratitude or acknowledging a debt. With this strategy, S can redress by openly expressing gratitude to H or by refusing to have H express gratitude to him. This can be seen in the following examples from the analyzed texts:

(45) Дұрыс айтасың. Мен үнемі айтамын... Саған қарызым көп.

You're right. I always tell them... I owe you a lot.

In the above example (45), S openly expressed his feelings of indebtedness in order to please the interlocutor who asked for help. So he tried to satisfy the hearer's need for politeness.

In the study, examples of the same content and topic (by classification) were not repeatedly given. The analyzed examples vary depending on the communicative context, depending on the situation and the speech of the interlocutors, were analyzed. The results of this study demonstrate that the findings of Brown and Levinson also correspond to the peculiarities of the Kazakh language.

In addition to qualitative analysis, a quantitative observation of the collected data was conducted in order to identify the distribution of negative politeness strategies in Kazakh discourse. The analysis shows that some strategies appear more frequently than others, depending on the communicative situation and the social relations between interlocutors (Table 1.).

Table 1. Distribution of Negative Politeness Strategies in the Analyzed Data

Strategy	Number of examples	Percentage
Conventionally indirect	20	16.7%
Hedging / questioning	18	15%
Being pessimistic	10	8.3%
Minimizing imposition	15	12.5%
Showing deference	22	18.3%
Apologizing	9	7.5%
Impersonalization	8	6.7%
Stating general rule	7	5.8%
Nominalization	6	5%
Expressing indebtedness	5	4.2%

The quantitative results indicate that showing deference and conventionally indirect forms are the most frequent strategies in Kazakh discourse. This tendency reflects the importance of respect, hierarchy, and interpersonal distance in Kazakh communicative culture. At the same time, strategies such as nominalization or expressing indebtedness appear less frequently but still play an important role in mitigating face-threatening acts.

Based on the analysis of the collected data, a general model of the realization of negative politeness strategies in Kazakh discourse can be proposed. This model includes three interconnected levels. The first level is the linguistic level, which includes modal constructions, lexical softeners, honorific address forms, and indirect questions used to mitigate face-threatening acts. The second level is the pragmatic level, which reflects communicative situations in which politeness strategies are employed, such as requests, refusals, advice, and criticism. The third level is the sociocultural level, which is related to culturally embedded norms of Kazakh communication, including respect for age, social hierarchy, and interpersonal distance. The interaction of these three levels forms a culturally specific system of negative politeness strategies in Kazakh discourse.

DISCUSSION

In this study, negative politeness strategies were analyzed according to the classification proposed in the Brown and Levinson Politeness Category System (BLPCS). The analysis covered the following strategies: Being Conventionally Indirect (Strategy 1), Questioning and Hedging (Strategy 2), Being Pessimistic (Strategy 3), Minimizing the Imposition (Strategy 4), Giving Deference (Strategy 5), Apologizing (Strategy 6), Impersonalizing Speaker and Hearer (Strategy 7), Stating the Face Threatening Act as a General Rule (Strategy 8), Nominalizing (Strategy 9), and Going on Record as Incurring a Debt or as not Indebting Hearer (Strategy 10).

The findings of this study generally support the theoretical framework proposed by Brown and Levinson [3], according to which negative politeness strategies function as universal mechanisms used by speakers to mitigate face-threatening acts and maintain social harmony in communication. The analysis demonstrates that many of the strategies identified in Brown and Levinson's model are also present in Kazakh discourse. At the same time, the results indicate that the realization of these strategies in the Kazakh language is strongly influenced by culturally specific communicative norms. In particular, strategies such as showing deference, indirectness, and minimizing imposition appear to be closely related to traditional values emphasizing respect for age, social hierarchy, and interpersonal distance. These cultural factors play an important role in shaping patterns of polite communication in Kazakh society.

Similar conclusions have been reported in previous studies devoted to politeness in Kazakh communication. Research on the linguocultural aspects of politeness emphasizes its role in maintaining harmonious social relations and regulating interpersonal communication [12]. In addition, studies examining Kazakh and Russian discourse show that politeness strategies often reflect culturally specific communicative patterns and social norms [13]. In recent years, research on the category of politeness has increasingly appeared in Kazakh linguistics. Some scholars approach the topic from a sociolinguistic perspective, while others analyze politeness within the framework of pragmalinguistics. The concept of politeness, which combines linguistic and cultural dimensions, has been described as a central element of communication in several studies [8], [9], [10], and [11]. However, most existing studies remain descriptive and focus mainly on traditional expressions, proverbs, greeting formulas, and etiquette norms. Empirical research based on authentic discourse data is still relatively limited, and both written and spoken language have rarely been examined systematically. Therefore, further research using larger datasets and comparative approaches would contribute to a deeper understanding of politeness strategies in Kazakh discourse.

CONCLUSION

This study took into account the politeness strategies used in Kazakhstan's Kazakh language. Using the politeness theory created by Brown and Levinson [3] and other research on the subject [14], [15], this study seeks to explain the emergence of these strategies in Kazakh. The politeness model created by Brown and Levinson was used as a general framework in this study, but various classifications and analytical techniques were added to better explain problems like limitations, apologetic behaviors, and addressing styles.

In recent years, the study of politeness has gained significant attention among researchers in Kazakh linguistics, especially in scholarly and peer-reviewed works. Scholars have examined this phenomenon through various theoretical perspectives. Several research studies take a sociolinguistic approach, examining how politeness mirrors social hierarchy, interpersonal relationships, and culturally ingrained behavioral norms. Various scholars analyze politeness within the realm of pragmalinguistics, interpreting it as a communicative approach that is executed through speech acts, discourse strategies, and language use that varies with context. Given its intertwining linguistic and cultural aspects, politeness is frequently recognized as an essential organizing principle of communication among people and has been defined as a significant concept in several linguistic analyses.

Besides these works, an assortment of publications in the Kazakh language explores general theoretical aspects of politeness, highlighting its definitions, functions, and significance within the culture. However, the research on distinct politeness approaches and methods is still quite narrow. Most studies available today are either descriptive or review-based, commonly analyzing classic proverbs, standards of etiquette, and traditional expressions rather than real linguistic data. Articles that review earlier studies or analyze the expression of politeness in traditional greetings and written communication provide valuable context, but they are lacking in empirical depth. Overall, there is a scarcity of studies that display analytical rigor, with a notable absence of systematic, data-focused investigations into spoken discourse and written texts.

The goal is to clarify the Kazakh language's usage of politeness in this manner. From this perspective, more texts should be examined, and research using bigger databases should be carried out. Research based on oral language data should also be prioritized (especially for each region and city separately). Lastly, comparative research with other Turkic languages from the past and present should be carried out as stated in the study's introduction.

REFERENCES

1. *Kazak tilinin tusindirme sozdigi* [Explanatory Dictionary of the Kazakh Language]. (2008). T. Zhanuzakov (Ed.). Almaty: Daik-Press. [in Kazakh].
2. Ożóg, K. (2001). Uwagi o współczesnej polskiej grzeczności językowej [Some remarks on contemporary Polish linguistic politeness]. In K. Ożóg, *Polszczyzna przełomu XX i XXI wieku: Wybrane zagadnienia* (pp. 73–84). Rzeszów: Otwarty Rozdział.
3. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
4. Fraser, B. (2010). Pragmatic competence: The case of hedging. In *New approaches to hedging*. Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing.
5. Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics* (Vol. 3, pp. 41–58). New York: Academic Press.
6. Goffman, E. (1967). On face-work: An analysis of ritual elements in social interaction. In *Interaction ritual: Essays in face-to-face behavior*. New York: Doubleday.
7. Locher, A. M. (2004). *Power and politeness in action: Disagreements in oral communication*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
8. Khamraeva, I. Sh. (2011). *Sypailyq kategoriyasy men salemdesu formulalary* [The category of politeness and greeting formulas]. *QazUU Khabarshysy. Philology Series — Bulletin of KazNU. Philology Series*, (2), 190–193. [in Kazakh].
9. Kakimova, M. E., Kadyrov, Zh. T., & Akhmetova, T. A. (2019). *Kazak tilindegi sypailyq ugymynyn magynasy* [The semantic nature of the concept of politeness in Kazakh]. *PMU Khabarshysy. Philology Series — Bulletin of Pavlodar State University. Philology Series*, (3), 172–184. [in Kazakh].
10. Kakimova, M. Y., & Olkova, I. A. (2019). The phenomenon “politeness” as a linguistic category. *Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы КМУ хабаршысы. Филология сериясы*, (4), 123–131.

11. Elemessova, M. (2017). *Sypailyq kody: quttyqtau khattary* [Politeness code: congratulatory letters]. *Kazakstanda is kagazdaryn zhurgizu — Record Management in Kazakhstan*, (3), 30–35. [in Kazakh].
12. Ryssaldy, K.T. & Utepova, A.N. (2018). Lingvocultural peculiarities of concept “politeness” in Kazakh and English languages and its influence on forming cross-cultural competence. *News of the national academy of sciences of the republic of Kazakhstan. Series of social and human sciences. Volume 2, Number 318*. 131-137.
13. Yergazy, N., & Denisenko, A. (2024). Implementation of positive and negative politeness strategies in Kazakh and Russian family discourse talk show. *RUDN Journal of Language Studies, Semiotics and Semantics*, 15(4), 1232–1244.
14. Peters, P., & Burke, I. (2025). Negative politeness and no worries in Australian English. *World Englishes*, 44(1–2), 253–268.
15. Singh, R., Singh, K., & Kundra, S. (2024). Negative and positive politeness strategies in the syntactic structures and hedging devices used in conversation in Bua Fiji Hindi. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 11(1).

Received: 22.01.2026

Қазақ тіліндегі жағымсыз сыпайылық стратегияларына прагматикалық талдау

Д.Сүлеймен¹, А.Б.Салқынбай¹

¹ Өл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Алматы қ., 050040, Қазақстан

Бұл мақалада ағылшын ғалымдары Браун мен Левинсонның сыпайылық категориясы теориясына сүйене отырып, қазақ тіліндегі сыпайылықтың негативті(жағымсыз) стратегияларына прагматикалық талдау ұсынылған. Негативті сыпайылық агрессив ұғымы бар сөйлесімдерді азайтуға, сөйлеушілер арасындағы әлеуметтік қашықтықты сақтауға және әңгімелесушінің тілдік тұлғасын құрметтеуге бағытталған коммуникативті стратегияларды білдіреді. Қазақ дискурсында бұл стратегиялар жас пен дәрежені құрметтеуден бөлек екі сөйлесуші тарап арасындағы мәдени қалыптасқан нормаларымен терең байланысты, олардың барлығы тұлғааралық қарым-қатынасты реттеуде басты орын алады.

Бұл зерттеудің негізгі мақсаты – қазіргі қазақ тіліндегі сыпайылықтың жағымсыз стратегияларын анықтау, оларды мазмұндық жіктеу және түсіндіру. Талдау нәтижесі қазақ тіліндегі жағымсыз сыпайылық дәстүрлі құндылықтарды және әлеуметтік құрылымдар мен коммуникативті тілдік ерекшеліктерді жүзеге асыруды көрсететін әмбебап прагматикалық заңдылықтарды ашып түсіндіретінін көрсетті. Сөйлеушілердің өтініштер, бас тартулар(жауап бермеу), кешірім сұрау, пікірді елемеу және институционалдық өзара әрекеттесу сияқты мәнмәтіндердегі қауіп төндіретін әрекеттерді(FTA – face-threatening act) жеңілдету тәсілдеріне ерекше назар аударылды.

Бұл мақалада сапалық және сандық әдістерді біріктіретін аралас әдістер тәсілі пайдаланылды. Деректер Алматы облысындағы күнделікті қарым-қатынастағы ауызша өзара сөйлесімдерден, сұқбаттардан және бұқаралық ақпарат құралдарындағы мәтіндерден алынды. Талдауда ағылшын ғалымдары Браун мен Левинсонның сыпайылықтың жағымсыз стратегияларын жіктеуі пайдаланылды, соның ішінде жанама, әдеттегі жанама өтініштер, кешірім сұрау, кінә таңуды азайту, атау, құрмет көрсету және сөйлеушінің де, тыңдаушының да күйіне ену сынды стратегияларға мысалдар келтірілді. Әрбір стратегияға қатысты мысал прагматикалық функциялар мен әлеуметтік-мәдени мотивтерді түсіндіру үшін өзінің тікелей мәнмәтінінде талданды.

Нәтижелер қазақ тіліндегі негативті(жағымсыз) сыпайылық стратегияларының әсіресе жас, әлеуметтік мәртебе немесе институционалдық рөлдердегі айырмашылықтармен сипатталатын асимметриялық коммуникативті жағдайларда айқын көрінеді. Талдау көрсеткендей, қазақ тілінде сөйлейтіндер таңбалауды барынша азайту үшін

жанама(астарлы) және құрметті білдіру формаларын жиі қолданады, осылайша сөздер сыпайылық стратегиялары арқылы қоғамдық келісім мен өзара сыйластыққа ықпал етеді.

Кілт сөздер: қазақ тілі, сыпайылық категориясы, прагматика, коммуникация, ауызша сөйлеу мәдениеті.

ӘДЕБИЕТТЕР ТІЗІМІ

- 1 Қазақ тілінің түсіндірме сөздігі. (2008). Т. Жанұзақов (бас ред.). Алматы: Дайк-Пресс.
- 2 Ożóg, K. (2001). Uwagi o współczesnej polskiej grzeczności językowej [Some remarks on contemporary Polish linguistic politeness]. In K. Ożóg, *Polszczyzna przelomu XX i XXI wieku: Wybrane zagadnienia* (pp. 73–84). Rzeszów: Otwarty Rozdział.
- 3 Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 4 Fraser, B. (2010). Pragmatic competence: The case of hedging. In *New approaches to hedging*. Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing.
- 5 Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics* (Vol. 3, pp. 41–58). New York: Academic Press.
- 6 Goffman, E. (1967). On face-work: An analysis of ritual elements in social interaction. In *Interaction ritual: Essays in face-to-face behavior*. New York: Doubleday.
- 7 Locher, A. M. (2004). *Power and politeness in action: Disagreements in oral communication*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- 8 Хамраева, И. Ш. (2011). Сыпайылық категориясы мен сәлемдесу формулалары. *ҚазҰУ хабаршысы. Филология сериясы*, (2), 190–193.
- 9 Какимова, М. Е., Қадыров, Ж. Т., & Ахметова, Т. А. (2019). Қазақ тіліндегі сыпайылық ұғымының мағынасы. *ПМУ хабаршысы. Филологиялық сериясы*, (3), 172–184.
- 10 Kakimova, M. Y., & Olkova, I. A. (2019). The phenomenon “politeness” as a linguistic category. *Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы КМУ хабаршысы. Филология сериясы*, (4), 123–131.
- 11 Елемесова, М. (2017). Сыпайылық коды: құттықтау хаттар. *Қазақстанда іс қағаздарын жүргізу = Делопроизводство в Казахстане*, (3), 30–35.
- 12 Ryssaldy, K.T. & Utepova, A.N. (2018). Lingvocultural peculiarities of concept “politeness” in Kazakh and English languages and its influence on forming cross-cultural competence. *News of the national academy of sciences of the republic of Kazakhstan. Series of social and human sciences. Volume 2, Number 318*.131-137.
- 13 Yergazy, N., & Denisenko, A. (2024). Implementation of positive and negative politeness strategies in Kazakh and Russian family discourse talk show. *RUDN Journal of Language Studies, Semiotics and Semantics*, 15(4), 1232–1244.
- 14 Peters, P., & Burke, I. (2025). Negative politeness and no worries in Australian English. *World Englishes*, 44(1–2), 253–268.
- 15 Singh, R., Singh, K., & Kundra, S. (2024). Negative and positive politeness strategies in the syntactic structures and hedging devices used in conversation in Bua Fiji Hindi. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 11(1).

Материал 22.01.2026 баспаға түсті

Прагматический анализ стратегий негативной вежливости в казахском языке

Д. Сулеймен¹, А.Б.Салкынбай¹

¹ Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби, Алматы, 050040, Казахстан

В данной статье представлен прагматический анализ стратегий негативной вежливости в казахском языке, основанный на теории категорий вежливости английских ученых Брауна и Левинсона в качестве теоретической основы. Негативная вежливость относится к коммуникативным стратегиям, направленным на снижение агрессивности

речи, минимизацию навязчивости, поддержание социальной дистанции и уважение языковой идентичности собеседника, которые в совокупности известны как сохранение негативного имиджа. В казахском дискурсе эти стратегии тесно связаны с укоренившимися в культуре нормами иерархии, уважения возраста и статуса, а также косвенности, которые играют центральную роль в регулировании межличностного общения.

Основная цель данного исследования – выявить и интерпретировать стратегии негативной вежливости, применяемые в современном казахском языке, классифицировать их по содержанию и объяснить их. Результаты анализа показывают, что негативная вежливость в казахском языке выявляет универсальные прагматические модели, отражающие специфические языковые реализации, сформированные традиционными ценностями, социальными структурами и коммуникативными ожиданиями. Особое внимание уделяется способам, которыми говорящие способствуют совершению действий, угрожающих репутации (FTA), в таких контекстах, как просьбы, отказы (отсутствие ответа), извинения, игнорирование мнений и институциональные взаимодействия.

В этом исследовании используется смешанный методологический подход, объединяющий как качественные, так и количественные методы. Данные были собраны из устных взаимодействий в повседневной коммуникации в Алматинской области, интервью и текстов в средствах массовой информации. В анализе используется классификация стратегий негативной вежливости, предложенная Брауном и Левинсоном, включающая косвенность, хеджирование, обычные косвенные просьбы, извинение, сведение к минимуму навязывания, проявление почтения и олицетворение как говорящего, так и слушающего. Примеры каждой стратегии анализируются в его непосредственном контексте, чтобы прояснить прагматические функции и социокультурную мотивацию.

Результаты показывают, что эти стратегии негативной вежливости в казахском языке особенно заметны в асимметричных коммуникативных ситуациях, характеризующихся различиями в возрасте, социальном статусе или институциональных ролях. Анализ показывает, что носители казахского языка часто предпочитают косвенные и почтительные формы выражения, чтобы свести к минимуму навязывание, тем самым способствуя социальной гармонии и взаимному уважению.

Ключевые слова: категория вежливости, казахский язык, прагматика, коммуникация, культура

СПИСОК ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ

- 1 Толковый словарь казахского языка. (2008). Под ред. Т. Жанузакова. Алматы: Дайк-Пресс.
- 2 Ożóg, K. (2001). Uwagi o współczesnej polskiej grzeczności językowej [Some remarks on contemporary Polish linguistic politeness]. In K. Ożóg, *Polszczyzna przełomu XX i XXI wieku: Wybrane zagadnienia* (pp. 73–84). Rzeszów: Otwarty Rozdział.
- 3 Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 4 Fraser, B. (2010). Pragmatic competence: The case of hedging. In *New approaches to hedging*. Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing.
- 5 Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics* (Vol. 3, pp. 41–58). New York: Academic Press.
- 6 Goffman, E. (1967). On face-work: An analysis of ritual elements in social interaction. In *Interaction ritual: Essays in face-to-face behavior*. New York: Doubleday.
- 7 Locher, A. M. (2004). Power and politeness in action: Disagreements in oral communication. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- 8 Хамраева, И. Ш. (2011). Категория вежливости и формулы приветствия. Вестник КазНУ. Серия филологии, (2), 190–193.

- 9 Какимова, М. Е., Кадыров, Ж. Т., Ахметова, Т. А. (2019). Значение понятия «вежливость» в казахском языке. Вестник Павлодарского государственного университета. Филологическая серия, (3), 172–184.
- 10 Kakimova, M. Y., & Olkova, I. A. (2019). The phenomenon “politeness” as a linguistic category. Вестник КМУ им. Ш. Уалиханова. Серия филологии, (4), 123–131.
- 11 Елемесова, М. (2017). Код вежливости: поздравительные письма. Делопроизводство в Казахстане, (3), 30–35.
- 12 Ryssaldy, K. T., & Utepova, A. N. (2018). Lingvocultural peculiarities of concept “politeness” in Kazakh and English languages and its influence on forming cross-cultural competence. News of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan. Series of Social and Human Sciences, 2(318), 131–137.
- 13 Yergazy, N., & Denisenko, A. (2024). Implementation of positive and negative politeness strategies in Kazakh and Russian family discourse talk show. *RUDN Journal of Language Studies, Semiotics and Semantics*, 15(4), 1232–1244.
- 14 Peters, P., & Burke, I. (2025). Negative politeness and no worries in Australian English. *World Englishes*, 44(1–2), 253–268.
- 15 Singh, R., Singh, K., & Kundra, S. (2024). Negative and positive politeness strategies in the syntactic structures and hedging devices used in conversation in Bua Fiji Hindi. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 11(1).

Материал поступил в редакцию журнала 22.01.2026

XFTAP 16.21.47

DOI:[10.59102/kufil/2026/iss1pp197-212](https://doi.org/10.59102/kufil/2026/iss1pp197-212)

Ш.А. Хамитова¹, А.С. Адилова¹, А.Ш. Каппасова¹, А.К. Жунусова²

¹Академик Е.А. Бөкетов атындағы Қарағанды ұлттық зерттеу университеті, Қарағанды, 100028, Қазақстан

²Қарағанды индустриялық университеті, Теміртау, 101400, Қазақстан

ТҮРКІ ТАҒАМ МӘДЕНИЕТІНІҢ АҒЫЛШЫН ТІЛІНДЕГІ ГАСТРОНОМИЯЛЫҚ ЛЕКСИКА АРҚЫЛЫ БЫҚПАЛЫ: ТҮРКІ ТЕКТЕС АСПАЗДЫҚ ТЕРМИНДЕР МЕН ДӘМДЕУШІ АТАУЛАРЫ

Мақала түркі халықтарының ас дайындау мәдениетінің ағылшын тіліндегі аспаздық лексика арқылы әсерінің тарихи-лингвистикалық тұрғыдан талдануына арналады. Мақалада түркі тектес аспаздық терминдердің үнді-еуропа тілдеріндегі таралу жолдары, семантикалық және фонетикалық бейімделуі, сондай-ақ мәдени ықпалы қарастырылады. Зерттеуде түркі тектес тағам атауларының үнді-еуропа тілдеріндегі әлеуметтік-мәдени себептері және тарихи қолданыста қаншалықты жиі кездескені графикте талданады. Бұл зерттеу түркі тілдерінен енген аспаздық терминдердің, әсіресе дәмдеуіш атауларының ағылшын гастрономиялық контекстеріндегі орнын және оның мәдени маңызын анықтауға бағытталады. Зерттеу нәтижесі көрсеткендей «кебаб», «йогурт», «палау» және «шашлык» сияқты түркі аспаздық терминдерінің ағылшын тілінің лексикалық құрамына еніп, мәдени ықпалдастықтың маңызды көрінісіне айналғанын байқауға болады. Мақала түркі-ағылшын тілдік байланыстарының аспаздық лексика деңгейіндегі эволюциясын талдап, лингвомәдениеттану мен тарихи лексикология саласындағы маңызды мәселелерді ашады.

Кейінгі жылдары түркі өркениетінің еуропалық мәдениетке, әсіресе тілдік деңгейде әсерін зерттеу лингвомәдениеттану, этнолингвистика және тарихи лексикология бағыттарында өзекті тақырыпқа айналып келеді. Бұл зерттеу мақаласы түркі