

**MENTAL ENLIGHTENMENT SCIENTIFIC –
METHODOLOGICAL JOURNAL****MENTAL ENLIGHTENMENT SCIENTIFIC –
METHODOLOGICAL JOURNAL**<http://mentaljournal-jspu.uz/index.php/mesmj/index>**CHARACTERISTICS OF POLITENESS STRATEGIES MANIFESTED IN
RELIGIOUS TEXTS****Mazmuna Rakhimovna Otaboyeva***PhD, Associate Professor**Kokand State University*mazmuna.rahimovna@gmail.com*Kokand, Uzbekistan***ABOUT ARTICLE**

Key words: religious text, politeness strategies, linguopragmatics, religious discourse, speech etiquette, communicative strategy, pragmatic analysis, sacred texts.

Received: 01.04.26**Accepted:** 02.04.26**Published:** 03.04.26

Abstract: This article analyzes the linguopragmatic features of politeness strategies manifested within the framework of religious texts. The study examines the principles of politeness expressed through speech units, forms of address, and communicative means such as requests, advice, and warnings used in sacred texts. It also highlights the role of politeness strategies in regulating interpersonal communication in religious discourse and reveals their ethical-normative content. In the process of analysis, the linguistic units in religious texts are examined from pragmatic and semantic perspectives, and the specific manifestations of politeness strategies are identified. The results of the study contribute to a deeper understanding of the communicative and educational significance of religious texts.

Introduction. In the process of sociolinguistic analysis of discourse, that is, a text that arises in the course of real communication, it is an important factor to take into account the social institutions existing in society. Such institutions include the education system, healthcare, the military sphere, judicial and law enforcement bodies, the political sphere, trade

and commerce, as well as sports. In addition, it is necessary to specifically emphasize religious structures that unite clergy and believers on the basis of common beliefs and rituals.

The analysis of religious discourse makes it possible to shed light on the deep characteristics of language and religion and holds particular importance in the linguistic study of the structure of institutional discourse and in the creation of classifications of discourse types. In linguistic literature, religious-preaching speech (or, in other approaches – ecclesiastical-religious functional style) has been substantiated as a separate type within the functional-stylistic paradigm of the modern Russian literary language .

When approached from the perspectives of linguistics and pragmatics, religious discourse is regarded as a complex and multi-layered phenomenon. This discourse encompasses not only the transmission of information but also such tasks as the formation of social, spiritual, and mental relationships. Religious speech has its own specific functions, which can conditionally be divided into two main groups: general (linguistic) and special (pragmatic) functions. While general functions are related to the universal characteristics of language, special functions define the specific pragmatic nature of religious discourse.

Materials and methods. Communicative, informative, and appellative functions are presented in linguistics as the basic functions of language. Some scholars also include emotive, phatic, metalinguistic, and poetic functions. The functions listed above appear in religious discourse in specific situations and give it a distinctive pragmatic character .

In general, the expression of a text through the linguistic and pragmatic functions of religious discourse holds significant importance in the spiritual environment of society. Religious discourse is a powerful discursive system that shapes human consciousness, strengthens moral values, and ensures social solidarity; it is also regarded as a means of communication and information transfer. A deeper understanding of the interrelationship between language and religion makes it possible to pay special attention to the linguistic and pragmatic study of religious discourse, as well as to scientifically strengthen the role of religious speech in modern developed society.

In the process of communication, the category of politeness is regarded as an important sociolinguistic and pragmatic phenomenon between people in society. In particular, in religious communication, politeness is significant not only as a measure of speech etiquette but also as a linguistic expression of ethical, spiritual, and religious values. In a deeper analysis of this phenomenon, the theory of social-linguistic scenarios and communicative roles serves as an important methodological basis.

It is known from the analysis of linguistic scenarios that each individual performs different social roles in various communication situations. For example, one individual may appear as a leader at the workplace, as a patient in a hospital, or as a child or parent in the family. In the context of religious communication, however, the individual participates in the roles of a believer, a worshipper, a confessor of sins, or a listener of advice. Each of these roles requires specific speech strategies and forms of politeness.

In the communicative process within society, the interactions of participants are regulated on the basis of expectations formed in relation to specific roles. Such expectations rely on ethical and speech norms defined by society. If a person does not demonstrate behavior and speech style corresponding to their social role, they may be negatively evaluated by the public or subjected to certain social restrictions. This aspect becomes particularly evident in the process of religious communication, since politeness and good manners are considered one of the main indicators of adherence to religious moral rules.

According to the sociolinguistic approach, communicative processes in society manifest themselves in various forms depending on individuals' social origin, social status, professional activity, and the position they hold. In the sphere of religious discourse, in addition to these factors, a person's level of faith, religious knowledge, and spiritual state also acquire special importance. Therefore, elements of politeness in religious communication perform a distinct pragmatic function: they ensure that speech is formed in a manner based on the principles of gentleness, humility, and respect.

Written religious communication — for example, appeals addressed to a religious advisor, imam, or advocate — demonstrates the orderly and consistent expression of politeness through linguistic means. In such texts, forms of address, units expressing respect, requests, and constructions conveying gratitude are widely used. Through these means, the social status of the communication participants and the social distance between them are reflected.

In modern linguistics, pragmatics is regarded as an important scientific field that studies how linguistic units are used in real communication processes, their relationship with the participants of speech, and the meanings that arise depending on the communicative situation. Pragmatics (from the Greek *pragma* — action) is a component of semiotics and investigates the aspects of sign systems that are closely connected with human activity. This approach makes it possible to interpret language not as an immutable, static system, but as a dynamic phenomenon that actively manifests itself in social, cultural, and religious contexts.

Results and discussions. In the present era, pragmatics is interpreted as the process by which language users express their attitude through specific words, semantic structures, and

speech strategies, as well as the process of understanding the interlocutor's intention and position. In this process, not only the content of speech but also its communicative purpose, the intended audience, cultural background, and social experience acquire significant importance.

In particular, religious texts carry a great semantic and communicative load from a pragmatic point of view. Therefore, understanding and interpreting them requires not only simple semantic analysis but a broader contextual and pragmatic approach.

The successful conduct of communication is closely linked to adherence to certain ethical norms and rules of conduct. Throughout the development of humanity, various peoples have created numerous proverbs and wise sayings concerning speech culture, verbal etiquette, and responsibility in communication, forming a rich scientific and literary heritage in this field. In particular, works such as *Qutadg'u bilig*, *Qobusnoma*, and *Hibbat ul-haqoyiq*, which are considered gems of Eastern national culture, as well as the works of thinkers like Kaykovus, Yusuf Khos Hojib, Ahmad Yassavi, Ahmad Yugnaki, Alisher Navoi, and Sufi Olloyor, deeply illuminate the issues of communication etiquette and speech responsibility from philosophical and ethical perspectives.

In particular, the moral instructions regarding speech culture presented in Kaykovus's work *Qobusnoma* retain their relevance even in the modern era. It emphasizes that the speaker must express their thoughts wisely and thoughtfully, taking into account the existing situation and the characteristics of the listeners. It is especially stressed that the content of speech should be fluent, simple, and not burdensome to the listener. Otherwise, even a well-supported argument may not be positively received by the audience.

In addition, taking into account the consent and emotional state of the interlocutors during the communication process is evaluated as an important factor that ensures effective and positive communication.

In 1967, one of the scholars from Harvard University, H. P. Grice, introduced the widely recognized communicative principles in the process of communication. According to Grice's concept, any effective communication depends on the principle of cooperation. The full implementation of the principle of cooperation requires the participants of communication to observe four basic communicative maxims. According to Grice's definition, these maxims are directly related to the form and manner in which information is transmitted. They are divided into the following principles: Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner (or Mode) .

According to Geoffrey Leech, the politeness principle manifests itself through the practical realization of six basic and self-evident rules. They are expressed as follows:

1. Tact Maxim – minimizing the “burden” or inconvenience imposed on the interlocutor as much as possible, while striving to maximize their benefit.
2. Generosity Maxim – being ready to limit one’s own interests and take upon oneself the necessary “cost” or responsibility.
3. Approbation Maxim – refraining from criticizing, disparaging, or gossiping about others; emphasizing their positive aspects more.
4. Modesty Maxim – reducing self-praise and not excessively displaying one’s own virtues.
5. Agreement Maxim – avoiding disputes and conflicts, and striving to reach agreement and harmony.
6. Sympathy Maxim – maintaining a warm attitude toward others and showing kindness and goodwill.

According to Penelope Brown and Stephen C. Levinson’s theory, politeness is a complex system of strategies designed to mitigate speech acts that threaten a person’s “face” (social image or prestige). They do not provide a precise and strict definition of the concept of “politeness,” but rather explain it on the basis of a scale consisting of two opposing directions: negative politeness and positive politeness.

The theory of politeness was first published in 1987 by Brown and Levinson. Although their views were later criticized by various scholars, this model continues to serve as an important theoretical foundation in pragmatic research to this day.

The authors divided their study into two main parts. The first part illuminates the essence and content of politeness theory, its basic concepts, definitions, and the mechanisms of interaction in language use. The second part contains examples of the application of politeness strategies in three languages that differ from one another socially and culturally — English, Tamil, and Tzeltal .

In the theoretical part, Brown and Levinson proceed from the concept of the “rational speaker” when presenting their model. According to them, such a speaker possesses two main characteristics: rationality (the ability to make reasonable decisions) and face (the need for social prestige and self-esteem). It is precisely these two factors that form the basis for the development of politeness strategies .

Rationality (Logical Reasoning). In the theory of Penelope Brown and Stephen C. Levinson, the central concept is the Model Person (MP). According to their interpretation, the MP is a person who can use natural language fluently and expressively, and who possesses two main characteristics: rationality and face. Rationality refers to the person’s ability to clearly

define their goals and consciously select appropriate means to achieve them. In other words, the Model Person analyzes the situation, takes into account possible consequences, and consciously plans their speech behavior in a way that satisfies face needs.

Face. The concept of “face” refers to the social image that a person wants to present in society — that is, their prestige and reputation in the eyes of others. Every individual wants to maintain their face, to be accepted by others without hindrance, and to be approved in certain situations.

Brown and Levinson divide face into two types:

Positive Face — the desire to be valued, recognized, and approved by others. It is the wish that one’s thoughts, goals, achievements, and values be acknowledged as important by others.

Negative Face — the need to preserve one’s freedom of action and choice. This means the desire to make independent decisions without pressure or interference from others.

Conclusion. The authors consider the needs related to face to be universal, that is, common to all cultures. However, they also emphasize that the manifestation of these needs depends on cultural norms and values. The claim of universality was later criticized by many researchers.

References:

1. Мечковская Н. Б. Язык и религия. Лекции по филологии и истории религий. Пособие для студентов гуманитарных вузов. — М.: ФАИР, 1998
2. Крысин Л. П. Иноязычное слово в контексте современной общественной жизни // Русский язык конца XX столетия. – М.: Наука, 1996. – С. 142–161;
3. Прохватилова О. А. Православная проповедь и молитва как феномен современной звучащей речи. – Волгоград: Волгоградский государственный университет, 1999. – 220 с.
4. Крысин Л. П. Иноязычные слова в современном русском языке. – М.: Наука, 1968. – 208 с.
5. Бобырева, Е. В. Религиозный дискурс: ценности, жанры, стратегии (на материале православного вероучения): автореф. дис. д-ра филол. наук: 10.02.19 / Бобырева Екатерина Валерьевна. - Волгоград: Волгоградский государственный педагогический университет, 2007. - 42 с.
6. Кубрякова, Е. С. Язык и знание: На пути получения знаний о языке: Части речи с когнитивной точки зрения. Роль языка в познании мира / Е. С. Кубрякова. - М.: Языки славянской культуры, 2004. - 560 с.

7. Кушнерук, С. Л. «Мир дискурса» в аспекте когнитивного моделирования (Вопросы дискурсивного анализа) / С. Л. Кушнерук // Вопросы когнитивной лингвистики. - 2013. - № 1. - С. 105-114.

8. Бобырева, Е. В. Религиозный дискурс: ценности, жанры, стратегии (на материале православного вероучения): автореф. дис. . д-ра филол. наук : 10.02.19 / Бобырева Екатерина Валерьевна. - Волгоград: Волгоградский государственный педагогический университет, 2007. - 42 с.

9. Levinson, P., Brown, P., Levinson, S. C., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). Politeness: Some universals in language usage (Vol. 4): Cambridge university press

10. Kaykovus. (1994). Qobusnoma. Toshkent: O'qituvchi.

11. Grice H. P. "Logic and Conversation" in Cole and Morgan, op. cit., pp: 41 - 58.

12. Erbert, L. A., & Floyd, K. (2004). Affectionate expressions as face-threatening acts: Receiver assessments. Communication studies, 55(2), 254-270.

13. Elen, G. (2001). A critique of politeness theories. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

14. Sandberg, S. (2010). "The Role Of Advertising on Facebook. Sheryl facebook's Chief operating officer". 338- 376.

15. Fraser, B. (2005). Whither politeness. PRAGMATICS AND BEYOND NEW SERIES, 139, 65

16. Gittan Jewad, H., Ghabanchi, Z., & Ghazanfari, M. (2020). Politeness strategies and maxims in English for Islamic texts: A sociolinguistic analysis of Quran. Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Special Issue on the English Language in Iraqi Context.

17. Sorour, I., Zaghoul, M., & Youssef, A. (2023). (Im) Politeness in Dialogues between some Prophets and the Polytheists in the Noble Qur'an: A Pragmatic Analysis. British Journal of Translation, Linguistics and Literature, 3(4), 54-82.