

## THE CONCEPT OF POLITENESS IN RUSSIAN AND UZBEK

**Omonbayev Oybek Kholbutayevich**

Lecturer of the Department of Russian Language and  
Literature of Andijan State University

**Annotation:**The article explores the problems of speech etiquette in the Uzbek language on the material of treatment and motivation using the personal pronoun in the singular and plural (sizni and siz-you, You;) the specifics of their use in speech situations of communication between parents and children, between spouses, etc. are identified and noted; differences in the use of the same etiquette expressions by native speakers of different dialects of the Uzbek language are demonstrated.

**Keywords:**Politeness, concept, linguoculture

In traditional linguistics, the semantics of politeness and the means of its implementation were not a special object of scientific research. However, the growing interest in the psychological, social and cultural aspects of language, the active study of speech acts of a living language, in one way or another, led researchers to the idea that in speech activity "necessary, but not supported by the natural inclinations of the human body, social forms are supported, motivated by the category of "decent" and "indecent", "polite" and "impolite". Linguists noted the necessity of etiquette, polite formalization of the statement in the structure of the dialogue.

Within the framework of traditional linguistics, the phenomenon of politeness was considered from the position of using stable expressions in speech associated with established norms of communication.

Vinogradov V.V. among the semantic and grammatical categories of interjections distinguishes a special category consisting of interjections, which are "a kind of expressive sound gestures exchanged according to social etiquette by acquaintances or acquaintances in different cases of life. These interjections express a complex chain of everyday emotions and rituals. For example: Mercy! thank you!; obsolete thank you! hello!; new: I'm sorry! etc." [Vinogradov 1972: 593].

Knowledge of the culturological features of concepts is necessary, first of all, for successful intercultural communication, which is confirmed by the works of authors representing intercultural communication as a research program: M. Bergelson, S.G. Ter-Minasova, T.G. Grushevitskaya, A.P. Sadokhin and others. It should be noted that within the framework of intercultural communication, several areas of research are distinguished.

One of them is related to the study of various communication styles used inside and outside a certain group. Representatives of the second direction study the peculiarities of discursive behavior in different cultures. Researchers working within the framework of cross-cultural pragmatics are engaged in a comparative analysis of the principles of communicative activity. Much attention within this direction is given to the principle of politeness, which has received extensive coverage in the work of English researchers P. Brown and S. Levinson, who proposed to distinguish between two main types of politeness: positive, based on solidarity with a communication partner, and negative, in which the speaker and the listener keep a distance. The basis of this classification is the assumption of the existence of a "social person in every person", which is threatened in the process of communication. Following P. Brown and S. Levinson, we believe that polite behavior is a set of strategies aimed at achieving optimal communication results, however, we believe that the interlocutor's face is not threatened in every communicative situation.

Another approach implemented in the research of A. Vezhbetskaya, S.G. Ter-Minasova and other linguists is related to the study of language correspondences. Proponents of this approach, citing numerous examples, convincingly prove that the translated equivalents of two languages often hide different meanings, cultural connotations.

The diversity of cultures of the world allowed such researchers as T.T. Hall, R. Lewis, G. Hofstede to identify common features in them and combine cultures into groups or types.

The differences in the understanding of politeness are evidenced by the fact that each culture has its own concept of politeness and this word itself has a different interpretation. So, according to dictionaries, in Russian, politeness is observance of the rules of decency, courtesy; in Uzbek, politeness is observance of the rules of decency, courtesy, a manifestation of modesty, respect and reverence in speech and actions, an expression of the degree of respect; in English, a demonstration of respect for others; in Chinese, a manifestation of modesty, respect and reverence in speech and actions, an expression of the degree of reverence.

There are languages in which this word is missing. It is not, for example, in the Ibo language, common in Nigeria, in the Lingala language (Congo). In addition to the word polite, the latter also lacks such words as thank you, excuse me, please, goodbye, which is explained by the closeness and equality of social relations, a high degree of solidarity (helping another is a natural behavior that does not require gratitude; personal space is minimal, intrusion into it does not require an apology). Each form of politeness is characterized by its own set of grammatical, word-formation, lexical means, for the correct choice of which the speaker needs to know the age and status of the interlocutor. That is why in these cultures, unlike in Europe, the question of age is quite natural and even necessary.

These facts are hardly grounds for calling some nations polite and others impolite or less polite. Comparative studies indicate a different understanding of politeness by representatives of different cultures and the discrepancy of this concept in the communicative consciousness, for example, of Russians and Germans, British and Greeks, Germans and Americans, etc.

Taking into account the typologizations of cultures proposed by the authors above, based on such characteristics as ways of transmitting and perceiving information, time distribution, behavioral reactions of communicants, distance of power, individualism /collectivism, avoidance of uncertainty, competitiveness, it seems possible to characterize the Russian and Uzbek linguistic cultures we are considering.

Differences in cultural funds make it possible to understand the importance of forming the communicative competence of participants in the process of intercultural communication: knowledge of information of a regional and cultural nature, the specifics of speech and non-speech behavior, the peculiarities of national courtesy systems. However, there is no doubt that the category of politeness is universal, as evidenced by language means, speech etiquette.

In the field of linguistics, many researchers devote their works to the study of various aspects of the category of politeness. At present, it is possible to distinguish several approaches in the study of this category: gender (K. Christie, S. Mills, L. Mallani, D. Spender, etc.), culturological (T.V. Larina, E.A. Arshavskaya, N. Ambadi, D. Hauz, etc.), sociolinguistic (D. Walters, L.V. Khokhlova, V.I. Gvazava, etc.), cognitive (V. Escandell-Vidal). N.V. Zorikhina-Nilsson and E.N. Belyaeva investigate the category of politeness in the light of the theory of speech acts. Politeness as a linguistic category is considered on the material of many languages of the world, but the comparative aspect has not yet been developed.

Since etiquette is a component of polite behavior, it seems appropriate to consider the difference between etiquette and politeness, which is pointed out by such authors as N.I. Formanovskaya, V.I. Safyanov, F. Horvat and Yu. Orlik et al . In their opinion, the main difference

between politeness and etiquette is that politeness is a moral quality based on respect for people, while etiquette is only an external manifestation, a demonstration of politeness.

Speech etiquette (N.I. Formanovskaya), i.e. "cultural pretense of politeness", according to O. Mandelstam. Speech etiquette is socially defined and culturally specific rules of speech behavior of people in communication situations in accordance with their social and psychological roles, role and personal relationships in official and informal communication settings. Etiquette behavior is standard and stereotypical, but violation of this behavior can lead to unpredictable consequences for a person, because, according to N.I. According to Formanov, communicative truth is higher in value for the cultural community of people than sincerity (truth).

To confirm the idea of the universality of the concept of politeness, we turned to the definitions of politeness, a polite person in the explanatory dictionaries of the Russian and Uzbek languages, from which it follows that the ideas of different peoples about a polite person have a common feature: he is a man with good manners, attentive to others, courteous. This is exactly what is the core of the concept under study.

Since the concept is an abstract mental entity that materializes in linguistic units of various levels, interconnected by semantic relations that reflect the essence of the concept and make up its semantic field, it seems important to turn to its comparative study in Russian and Uzbek. As a result of the analysis of the etymology of the word politeness, its synonymous and word-formation series in the languages under consideration, the following differences were identified:

Russian has a significant proportion of synonyms, the semantic meaning of which reflects the orientation of polite behavior towards someone (to confirm this idea, you can refer to the word formation of Russians by the origin of words of this synonymous series: so, courteous is formed from taking into account something, someone's opinion, warning - from warning someone whose-either actions, words, courteous - from circumventing, courting someone, respectful - from respecting, respecting someone. In these verbs, the focus of the action on another subject is clearly traced);

Russian has several synonyms borrowed, respectively, from French into Russian (delicate - delicat, courtly-courtois and gallant-galant). Obviously, this fact is evidence of certain historical events: cultural ties between Russia and France;

in the Uzbek synonymic series there are such meanings as simple, modest, shy and respectful in the words iboli, ekimli, izzatli, tortinchok, khurmatli;

-in the Uzbek language, word-formation series are wider, there are several nouns in them, as well as verbs (I think we should pay attention to the negative connotation of these verbs), the semantic meaning of which implies insincerity in behavior: depsiz (to allow, allow (yourself) indecency, rudeness), sipox (to stand on ceremony; to seem polite, courteous);

-the word-formation series of the Russian language contains a word with a diminutive suffix -enk- in the adverb politely.

Defining what politeness is in the intercultural aspect is an extremely difficult task. Traditionally, it is believed that politeness is a manifestation of respect for another person. It is associated with such concepts as respectfulness, gallantry, correctness, courtesy. However, when considering the question of politeness, one should proceed from the fact that such seemingly universal concepts as politeness, respect, attention, and reverence have different contents in different linguistic cultures (cf., for example, attention to an unfamiliar woman in Arab and Latin American countries, respect for elders in the East and in Europe).

Each culture has its own concept of politeness, and this word itself has a different interpretation (we are talking about a linguocultural concept, which means "a conditional mental unit aimed at a comprehensive study of language, consciousness and culture"). Comparative studies in

this area indicate a discrepancy between the concept of politeness in the communicative consciousness of different peoples. Russian Russians and Uzbeks have significant differences and certain similarities in the understanding of politeness, which explain many features of their communicative behavior, in order to find out how speakers of Russian and Uzbek communicative cultures understand politeness, we conducted an associative experiment that showed that Russians and Uzbeks have both significant differences and certain similarities in the understanding of politeness.

Representatives of the Uzbek linguistic culture also associate politeness with the circle of communication, family. It is obvious that the manner of communication and the support of a person's dignity in the process of communication have a certain meaning for them (pleasant impression, status, mutual understanding and mutual respect of elders and juniors, refinement, intelligence, conversation without command or neglect, not interrupting others, giving the opportunity to speak out, the desire to please, high society). Interestingly, Russian respondents indicate sincerity, morality, voluntary polite behavior (sincerity, sympathy, moral qualities, friendliness, attentive attitude to people, smile, decent behavior, helps to love each other, good deeds, naivety, good mood, kind bright eyes, positive emotions, treat another as yourself). Russian Russians think of politeness as an inner, spiritual quality (it should be noted here that the Russian smile is not accidentally attributed to spiritual qualities. In their research, such leading Russian scientists as S.G. Ter-Minasova, I.A. Sternin, etc. they show that in the Russian language consciousness, a smile is associated with a sincere disposition to the interlocutor, joy at a meeting.

Most associations of representatives of both Uzbek and Russian linguistic cultures have a positive coloring, which is confirmed by the presence of such evaluative adjectival and adverbial components as good, bright, kind, moral, pleasant, attentive, culturally correct, polite, positive, worthy (Rus.); yoqimli (pleasant), muloyim, sipoli (polite), yahshi (good) (judahyahshi is the best), bosilgan (balanced), madaniyatli (cultured), sirli (relevant) (Uzbek).

Positivity in the perception of politeness is also confirmed by the fact that verbs and nouns with negative meanings are used in a negative form: do not swear, do not shout, do not offend, do not interrupt, without command or neglect, do not be rude.

The main distinguishing feature of the Uzbek associative series of the concept of politeness was that it much more often includes family members: mother, father, grandmother, grandfather, brother, sister, aunt, daughter-in-law (104 cases in total), whereas Russian respondents named only mother, father, grandmother, grandfather, brother (22 cases in total). This confirms the idea that Uzbek culture is collectivist, where the traditions of nepotism are particularly strong to this day. Russian collectivism is aimed at communicating not with the family (with all related relatives), but with a collective of people united by some common activity.

As a result of the analysis of the answers to the question regarding the goals of politeness, the following result was obtained. The majority of representatives of Uzbek linguoculture take into account the principles of politeness, since "it is customary for educated people" (43.1%), which emphasizes the traditional views in Uzbek linguoculture.

Russian respondents preferred the item "to establish a positive emotional contact (to make friends)", which indicates the importance of the communicative process in Russian linguoculture.

The respondents' answers to the question "Who should be more polite with?" allowed us to draw the following conclusions regarding the behavioral orientation of polite behavior: Uzbek respondents believe that it is necessary to be polite, first of all, with relatives and people older in age, while Russian respondents prefer elders, and then relatives. To a large extent, Russian respondents

associate politeness with their superiors (II place, 16%). Among the Uzbeks, and in the second place, more preference is given again to elders and relatives.

In the last task, the subjects were asked to express their opinion about the difference between the politeness of Uzbeks and Russians. We will make a reservation that this task caused the respondents a lot of difficulties, and in some cases the answers were not given. There were many similar responses received from Russian and Uzbek respondents, and we believe that this gives grounds to draw certain conclusions. The main characteristics given by Russians to themselves were the following: hospitality (10%), willingness to help (10%), respect for elders (8%), sociability (4%), as well as: respect for colleagues, sincerity, always invited to the table, emotionality, culture, kindness, attention to to a woman, unselfishness, breadth of soul. Representatives of Uzbek linguoculture gave the following characteristics to Russians: good manners (8.6%), trust and courtesy (5.1%), politeness towards friends (5.1%), hospitality (5.1%), friendliness (3.4%), invite to the table (3.4%), kindness (3.4%), wish health (3.4%), well cared for (3.4%), as well as: eloquence, sociability, noisy, friendly, able to keep silent at the right moment, openness, solidarity, with a smile (i.e. from the heart), too smart.

Russian Russians and Uzbeks were almost unanimous in their politeness, pointing out that it consists primarily in hospitality (29.3% among Uzbeks and 22% among Russians) and respect for elders (14% among Russians). In addition, 8.6% of Uzbek respondents believe that their politeness lies in everything, and another 5.2% consider representatives of their linguistic culture to be the most polite; also, such characteristics are given as: respect for elders, tact, good manners, respect for guests, kindness, courtesy, conscientiousness, humility, friendliness, noisy communication, respect for superiors and the more well-off. Russian respondents, in addition to the above, gave only two characteristics to Uzbeks: assistance to relatives and cohesion.

In addition, in both Russian and Uzbek minds, being polite means observing tacitly established rules of behavior. Taking this as a basis, we can assume that politeness is a balance, a balance between intimacy and distance (horizontal relations), asymmetry of relations and equality (vertical relations); impoliteness is a violation of this balance. At the same time, the point of this equilibrium varies not only depending on the specific communicative context, but also on the type of culture as a whole. The task of communicants is to optimally choose politeness strategies in accordance with the socio-cultural norms and expectations of the partner, so as not to be either overly formal or too familiar. That is why politeness is a flexible system of strategies.

The data obtained allowed us to generalize the following distinctive components of the associative series of the concept of politeness: hospitality, respect for elders - in Uzbek, sociability, sincerity, benevolence, sincerity - in Russian.

Since etiquette is an external manifestation of politeness, it seemed appropriate to analyze the features of the functioning of etiquette formulas in the linguistic cultures under consideration. The choice was made in favor of greeting, farewell and addressing formulas, which is due to the frequency of their use and wide verbal representation.

In Russian and Uzbek cultures based on collectivism and solidarity, there is no such cultural value as personal autonomy. In their communicative consciousness there is an opposite concept - communication, the significance of which is so great that some researchers call communication a communicative category [Sternin 2002; Shamanova 2002]. It is this cultural value that determines many features of the communicative behavior of Russians and Uzbeks.

Based on the above, for intercultural research, we propose to define politeness as a nationally specific communicative category, the content of which is a system of ritualized strategies of communicative behavior (linguistic and non-linguistic) aimed at harmonious, conflict-free

communication and compliance with socially accepted norms in interactive communication. The regular use of certain strategies leads to the formation of specific features of communicative behavior, communicative dominants, on the basis of which the national style of communication develops.

### References:

1. Negmatov, M. K., & Adashevich, T. A. Water purification of artificial swimming pools. Novateur Publication India's International Journal of Innovations in Engineering Research and Technology [IJIERT] ISSN, 2394-3696.
2. Negmatov, M. K., Zhuraev, K. A., & Yuldashev, M. A. (2019). Treatment of Sewage Water of Electrical Production on Recycled Filters. International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Engineering and Technology, 6(10), 11132-11135.
3. Negmatov, M., Boboeva, G., & Negmatov, U. (2022, August). Environmental aspects of processing and use wastewater sludge in agriculture. In IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science (Vol. 1076, No. 1, p. 012046). IOP Publishing.
4. Negmatov, M. K., Atamov, A. A., & Buriev, E. S. (2017). Automation of water supply systems and instrumentation. Study guide/-Tashkent: ed."Tafakkur Bustoni.
5. Negmatov, M. K. (2021). WATER EXCHANGE MODE IN SWIMMING POOLS WITH RETURN WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM. EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR), 7(4), 1-1.
6. Негматов, М. К., Атамов, А. А., & Буриев, Э. С. (2017). Автоматика систем водоснабжения и контрольноизмерительные приборы. Учебное пособие/-Ташкент: изд."Тафаккур Бустони.
7. Mamajanov, M., & Negmatov, M. K. A Simplified Method for Determining the Water Supply of Centrifugal and Axial Pumping Units of Municipal Water Supply Systems. International Journal of Innovations in Engineering Research and Technology, (1), 1-7.
8. Karimovich, N. M., Sharipovich, J. S., & Abduxamidovich, A. A. (2023). FILTRATION OF NATURAL WATER WITH INCREASED UPFLOW SPEED. European International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Management Studies, 3(01), 07-20.
9. Негматов, М. К. (2023). Методика проведения лекционных занятий при изучении дисциплины «системы водоснабжения и водоотведения» в инженерных вузах. So 'ngi ilmiy tadqiqotlar nazariyasi, 6(5), 227-238.
10. Negmatov, M., Kovalenko, V. I., Shumnyj, V. K., & Asrorov, K. A. (1975). Induction of CMS in cottonplants by means of radiation-induced mutagenesis. Genetika, 11(12), 136-138.
11. Negmatov, M., Kovalenko, V. I., Shumnyj, V. K., & Asrorov, K. A. (1975). Induction of CMS in cottonplants by means of radiation-induced mutagenesis. Genetika, 11(12), 136-138.
12. Негматов, М. К., & Ахунов, Д. Б. (2022). Системы водоснабжения и водоотведения. Учебно-методический комплекс. Наманган. НамИСИ.
13. НЕГМАТОВ, М. К., КЕРОВ, В. А., ЗАЙЦЕВ, С. В., & СЛАВИНСКИЙ, А. С. (1990). Фильтр для очистки жидкости.
14. Негматов, М. К., Атамов, А. А., Негматов, У. М., Вспомогательными, Г. О. П. С., & Материалами, Ф. (2020, June). ECLSS Online 2020b. In 2nd ECLSS International Online Conference on Economics and Social Sciences. Istanbul/TURKEY.
15. Negmatov, M. K., & Atamov, A. A. Suv ta'minoti tizimlari avtomatikasi va nazorat-o'lchov asboblari." Tafakkur bustoni" nashriyoti, 1, 1-367.
16. Рудзский, Г., Ким, А. Н., Негматов, М. К., & Ризо, Е. Г. (1989). Опыт-промышленная линия доочистки сточных вод Колпинского литейно-механического завода. Очистка природных и сточных вод: Тез. док/ВНИИВОДГЕО. Москва, 148-149.

17. Негматов, М. К. (2021). Некоторые рекомендации по изучению раздела технологии водоподготовки “Фильтрация природных вод” на основе систематизированной диаграммы Венна. Непрерывное образование. Ташкент, 62-66.
18. TK, M. N., & Atamov, A. Water purification on pressure filters. LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing, 1, 1-135.
19. Негматов, М. К., & Салиева, Г. Т. (2013). Интерактивные формы обучения применительно к специальным дисциплинам/Республика илмий-амалий конференция материаллари тупламида. 2-кисм. 44-46 бетлар.
20. Negmatov, M., Shumhyi, V. K., & Kovalenko, V. I. (1972). Male sterility of cotton; a review. Khlopkovodstvo.