

## The Relationship Between Culture, Religion and Mythology in Kazakh Curses

Ardak Abdyrova<sup>1</sup>, Bigaisha Akhmetova<sup>2</sup>, Ardak Tleulessova<sup>3\*</sup> , Aitbibibi Orazbayeva<sup>4</sup>, Marzhan Akosheva<sup>5</sup>, Shakhniza Kabulova<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Margulan University, Olzhabay Batyr, 60, Pavlodar140003, REPUBLIC OF KAZAKHSTAN

<sup>2,3,5,6</sup>Department of Kazakh and Russian Languages, S.Seifullin Kazakh Agrotechnical Research University, Zhenis Ave. 62, Astana 010011, REPUBLIC OF KAZAKHSTAN

<sup>4</sup>Pedagogical Institute, Astana International University, Kabanbay batyr Ave, 8, Astana 010011, REPUBLIC OF KAZAKHSTAN

\*Corresponding Author: [abitovad@inbox.ru](mailto:abitovad@inbox.ru)

**Citation:** Abdyrova, A., Akhmetova, B., Tleulessova, A., Orazbayeva, A., Akosheva, M. and Kabulova, S. (2025). The Relationship Between Culture, Religion and Mythology in Kazakh Curses, *Journal of Cultural Analysis and Social Change*, 10(2), 378-385. <https://doi.org/10.64753/jcasc.v10i2.1609>

**Published:** November 11, 2025

### ABSTRACT

The curse belongs to the most ancient genres of oral communication in the Kazakh culture. It is based on belief in the magical function of the word, in the ability to bring harm and evil to the cursed with the help of sacral and magical powers. Kazakh kargys is a pattern, stable verbal formulas are preserved in the linguistic consciousness of the modern native speakers, despite the fact that the archaic foundations may not be fully understood by them. The aim of the article is to analyze the specifics of the propositional structure of the genre of curse Kazakh language, to typologize the nature of harm and evil inflicted on the addressee, to identify some cultural, religious, linguistic and pragmatic features of the genre. The pragmatic and semantic features associated with the ancient Turkic mythology and religion are revealed. For the feasibility and strength of the influence of the kargys, the status of the one who curses and the one who is cursed is important – the age, the family, the social status. The objectification of the verbal predicate in the kargys is significant and fundamental, even the contracted forms preserve it. The actants in the structure of the proposition of curse are optional; their elimination is carried out on various semantic and pragmatic grounds. The Kazakh language provides formulas for counteracting the destructive genre of curse, including the formula for depriving the force of the curse and the formula for returning it to the one who curses.

**Keywords:** Kazakh Curse, Kargys, Ancient Turkic Mythology, Religion, Tengrism

### INTRODUCTION

The curse belongs to the oldest oral-speech genres and is a verbalized wish of evil to someone, addressed to supernatural mystical forces and based on the conviction of the carriers of archaic consciousness in the magical power of the word (Kaskabasov, 2009: 8). In the ethnolinguistic dictionary it is defined as follows:

a verbal formula containing a wish for troubles and misfortunes addressed to a specific person (a group of persons, people, animals, natural objects and elements, the mythological characters, etc.); a verbal ritual, which aims to inflict damage on the offender, enemy, with the magic power of the word, sending evil fate on him or her; a demonstrative act of breaking family or social ties with a person who violates laws and customs. The utterance of the curse was regulated in accordance with the circumstances (Vinogradova & Sedakova, 2009: 286).

E.L. Berezovich, O.D. Surikova speaks about the primary function of the curse and the subsequent expansion of functions: “Initially, curses had a magical function – to punish with a word, then curse formulas began to be used, in addition to magic, in the function of “emotional discharge” (2017: 67). Having changed its primary magical function in its original archaic ritual representation, the curse actively functions in the speech of modern native speakers of the language and culture as a wish of evil to someone in an emotionally intense conflict situation (Abisheva, Akosheva, et al., 2024). Although researchers talk about the reduction or even loss of their original magical purpose by curses, their use in modern speech, the frequency and prevalence of this genre show that in the area of the subconscious and unconscious, a person stubbornly retains faith in the power of the word, in its ability to harm. Otherwise, in a situation of acute emotional conflict, a person would be limited to using such destructive genres as insult, swearing, name-calling, vilification, etc. (Temirgazina, 2013), not directly based on the magical power of the word and would not resort to curses as a means of inflicting moral and physical harm on the offender.

The curse as a linguistic object was shown by such scholars as Sh.H. Blank (1950–1951), Ch.F. Fensham (1962), C.A. Kratz (1989), T. Jay (2000) and others. We find interesting Kratz's interpretation of cursing as a genre of power, to which she also refers blessings and oaths: “Genres of power are ways of speaking which have an implicit hierarchy of social power in their performance’ (1989: 636). She defines three dimensions of differential power and authority: ‘power of social category, power of rank and power of tradition’ (Kratz, 1989: 636). Jay in “Why We Curse. A neuro-psycho-social theory of speech” (2000) describes in detail the psychological, social, religious and cultural factors of the curse, reveals its psycholinguistic nature, connection with verbal aggression, analyzes the vocabulary, semantics and syntax of the curse in English. Puértolas Rubio (2022) considers ancient Luvian curses as part of religious discourse.

The works of L.N. Vinogradova (2005), L.N. Vinogradova, I.A. Sedakova (2009), I.V. Kryukova (2011), E.L. Berezovich, O.D. Surikova (2017), L.V. Balashova (2017), D.V. Medvedeva, N.A. Deputatova (2019) and others are devoted to the curse in Slavic and other languages. In Kazakh linguistics, the curse was studied by B. Uakhatov (1974), K. Mashkhur-Zhusip (1999; 2000), B. Bopayuly (2003), S. Kaskabasov (2009), B. Ospan (2017), R.Sh. Baydullaeva, N.B. Aynabekov (2018) and others. The Kazakh researchers considered the curse in a mandatory correlation with the oppositional genre *algys* ‘blessing’. Thus, in the book of Bopayuly (2003) “Kazaktyn algystary men kargystary” (‘Kazakh blessings and curses’), the semantics and functioning of the *algys* genre, which is considered as a positive statement, is analyzed, *kargys* is opposed to it as a negative statement – malevolence. Mashkhur-Zhusip (1999) investigated the functioning of the curse in the lyrical texts, their artistic and aesthetic role.

However, in the studies of the Kazakh *kargys*, scientists did not touch upon the problem of their actant structure, the problem of reflecting ancient Turkic mythology in the semantics of actants. Thus, our work fills some “gaps” in the study of Kazakh curses. Analysing the process of emergence, transmission, and resulting vicissitudes is a way of demystifying as well as simplifying understanding (Ghimire, 2024: 117). The identification of culturally specific forms of curse, due to the pagan, religious, mythological worldview of the speakers of a particular language and culture in which this genre was formed, exists and still functions, is an important direction of its interdisciplinary scientific study (Temirgazina, Akosheva, et al., 2022).

The oral-speech genre is considered by us as one of the most ancient forms of human existence and the transmission of cultural meanings. It is in it that one can find a reflection of all the perspectives of the worldview accumulated and selected by the people, its content, as well as the projection of a peculiar sense of the order of life (Baydauletova & Kenzhebaeva, 2016: 83).

A curse is defined by many researchers as a speech formula – a stereotyped, clichéd statement or pattern. A pattern as a stable model of socio-cultural consciousness and behavior became the object of study in the work of W. Labov (1972). Cultural patterns due to the mythological, religious-mystical and pagan thinking are fixed in the typical speech formulas that seem to “conserve” them, even if native speakers do not fully understand their original meaning or have lost their understanding altogether.

Our goal is to reveal the relationship of the genre of the Kazakh curse *kargys* with the ancient Turkic language, mythology, religion; determine the propositional structure of curse statements, their semantic types and pragmatic-linguistic features.

## MATERIAL AND METHODS

The material is extracted from the phraseological dictionary of the Kazakh language by I.K. Kenesbaev “Kazak tilinin frazeologialyk sozdigi” (‘Phraseological Dictionary of the Kazakh language’) (hereinafter – PDKL), G.Zh. Otemisova “Kazak tilindegi konergen atalymdar lugaty” (‘Dictionary of obsolete names of the Kazakh language’) (hereinafter – DONKL), from the work of Baydullaev, Aynabekov (2018). We chose units with the mark “*kargys*” in the amount of 163.

Next, we analyzed the actant composition of the proposition contained in kargys. Then we carried out a content analysis by the nature of harm and damage, on the basis of which a semantic typology of kargys was built. The lexical composition of curse statements, accompanied by etymological and cultural commentary, was also analyzed. For this, the “Drevnetyurkskiy slovar” (“Old Turkic Dictionary”) edited by D.M. Nasilov, I.V. Kormushin et al. (2016) (hereinafter – OTD), “Etimologicheskiy slovar' tyurkskikh yazykov” (“Etymological dictionary of the Turkic languages”) edited by G.F. Blagova (1997) (hereinafter – EDTL), “Mify narodov mira” (“The Myths of the peoples of the world”) edited by S.A. Tokarev (2008).

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Propositional Structure of the Kazakh Curse Kargys

Kargys or curse is typologically defined by Kazakh researchers as a folklore genre (Mashkhur-Zhusip, 2006; Kaskabasov, 2009). They are included in the collections, anthologies of Kazakh folklore (Uakhatov, 1974; Bopayuly, 2003) and some dictionaries (PDKL; DONKL).

The noun kargys ‘a curse’ and the verb kargau ‘to curse’ are of ancient Turkic origin. The examples in the dictionary show that the ancient Turks associated the curse with the religious beliefs, in particular with the god Tanri ‘Tengri’. Further, this relationship will be confirmed on specific examples of Kazakh curses. The close connection of the curse with religious discourse and local traditions is also emphasized by Puértolas Rubio, who explores Luwian curses in ancient Hittite texts: ‘Luwian incantations embedded in Hittite ritual texts reflect local traditions and religious discourses of different parts of Anatoliya and Northern Syria’ (2022: 138).

The Kazakh verb kargau is semantically and derivationally related to the verb karganu ‘to swear’ (Bektaev, 2003: 277). In other words, in the Kazakh language the concepts of curse and oath are interrelated. EDTL also notes that a verb kargy has two meanings “to curse, to damn – in all sources” (1997: 305). In the ancient Turkic language, in addition to the concept of karyish, there was a similar, but not coinciding with it, concept of arvash – “spell: qam arvash arvadi. The shaman cast spells (MK I 283)” (OTD: 63). This differentiation is significant, as it demonstrates that the ancient Turks were clearly aware of the destructive nature of the curse karyish and the constructive function of the spell arvash. Thus, in the ancient Turkic culture, there were people arvischi who professionally performed the ritual of spells and thereby helped people (OTD: 63).

Berezovich, Surikova list and characterize the types of actants included in the propositional structure of Slavic curses: In addition to the predicate, the stable logical structure of curses includes other actants, the main ones are as follows: the object is the person who is wished harm, and the actor acting in the curse and designed to harm the object (the subject-causator of the action), topos is a remote / dangerous place where the cursed person must go (2017: 68–69).

The proposed actant structure of the Slavic curse is similar to the Kazakh kargys. However, in addition to the listed actants, we consider it is necessary to include the subject in the proposition of the speaker expressing a wish and uttering a curse, which is usually manifested by the first-person pronouns in performative curses like ‘I curse you!’ Kryukova called such statements the curses-declarations (2011: 13–14).

The Kazakh language does not use the performative form of the 1st person singular of present tense of the indicative kargaimyn (‘I curse’) from the verb kargau. Kazakhs do not say Men seni kargaimyn! (‘I curse you!’), but choose a more neutral form of expression of the curse, which does not indicate the speaker as the 1st person. In other words, the speaker does not directly take responsibility for uttering a curse, since cursing is an act condemned by society that violates the ecology of speech and communication in general. Consequently, the subject of speech is eliminated in the proposition: Kargys ticin! (‘Damn you!’).

The most typical form of the verbal predicate in Kazakh kargys is the specific form of the verb in the imperative mood of the 2nd person in the presumptive meaning, which is formed with the help of the affixes -gyr/-gir, -kyr/-kir: Zhairap kalgyr! (‘May you die!’). The indicated form of the verb expresses the optative modality of the utterance. Kryukova defines this type as malevolence, in contrast to performative curses-declarations and curses-wishes (2011: 14). In addition, the verbs can be used in the form of the imperative mood of the 3rd person with the affixes -syn/-sin, -tyn/-tin, -dyn/-din: Zhairap kalsyn! (‘Let him die!’).

Regarding the obligatoriness of actants, an opinion is expressed that all actants in the structure of Slavic curses are not obligatory:

It is symptomatic that none of the actants is strictly obligatory (explicated in the vast majority of texts), including the predicate, for all its fundamental significance. ... In a number of texts, the predicate is eliminated and replaced by other components of the logical structure – for example, an actor or a topos, which take on the function of the main “conductor” of the illocutionary goal (causing harm with a word = action) (Berezovich & Surikova, 2017: 69).

In Kazakh kargys, all actants can also be eliminated – the subject of speech, the actor, the topos, except for the verbal predicate. We have not identified cases of elimination of the verb form from the propositional structure, the truncated forms of the curse also retain the predicate: *Zhairagyr!* ('May you die!').

Actants in the propositional structure of the Kazakh kargys are not obligatory in nature for various reasons:

- 1) the subject-speaker does not designate himself / herself because of fear that the one who pronounces the curse commits a taboo action that is not approved by the society and a mystical evil can turn against him / her;
- 2) the addressee of the curse is known from the situation, since the genre of the curse is always performed in the direct interpersonal communication – face to face and does not require the mandatory manifestation of the addressee; sometimes naming it is semantically redundant, since the verb form contains an indication of the form of the 2nd person;
- 3) the actor, called upon by the subject of speech to harm the addressee, is also not always indicated, since the Kazakhs have a socio-cultural pattern – a stable idea of magic forces, demons, evil spirits capable of carrying out the invoked punishment.

The sociocultural stereotype “the harm to the cursed person is caused by the influence of mystical / religious forces caused by the curser” allows the subject of speech, as it were, to transfer responsibility for negative actions to higher powers: gods, demons, evil spirits, etc. L.V. Balashova also believes that for a curse “a mystical / religious factor becomes fundamentally significant: negative consequences for the object / addressee must occur as a result of the action of third (sacred) forces” (2017: 12).

In Kazakh kargys, gods and characters of Turkic demonology *Tanir* ('Tengri'), *aruak* ('spirit of ancestors'), *saytan* ('devil'), *albasty* ('evil spirit, demon') and others are traditionally the actors: *Tanir algyr!* ('May Tengri take you!') (PDKL: 30); *Aruak atkyr / urgyr!* ('May the spirits of your ancestors punish you!') (PDKL: 30); *Albasty baskyr!* (PDKL: 21); *Saytan algyr!* ('May the devil take you!') (PDKL: 248).

Among the religious actors in the material we have collected, *Allakh* is not mentioned. For the ancient Turks who professed Tengrianism, the supreme deity was *Tanrı* ('Tengri') – the sky. The term *Tengri* “belongs to the most ancient mythological fund of the peoples of Central Asia and, possibly, was presented in the Xiongnu language (3rd century BC and earlier)” (Tokarev, 2008: 272–273). The use of the name of the god *Tanir* ('Tengri') testifies to the ancient Turkic roots of kargys. *Albasty* is also a character of ancient Turkic demonology (Tokarev, 2008: 47–48).

The functioning of the name of this evil spirit in curses is quite understandable: it can send illness, nightmares, but especially harm women in the childbirth and newborns. Therefore, curses calling *Albasty* are most often addressed to women.

As a topos, a kargys mentions the grave or “that” world – the world of the dead, where it is desirable to send the cursed: *Korinde okirgir* ('May you roar in your grave!'); *Eki dunieden kyzyk kormegir!* ('So that you do not see happiness either in this or in the next world!').

For Kazakhs, it is important by whom and in relation to whom the curse ritual is carried out, since its feasibility in reality and the strength of the curse depend on this. In the proverbs *It kargysy borige zhukpas* ('The dog's curse will not stick to the wolf'), *Koy kargysy borige zhetpeydi* ('The curse of the sheep will not reach the wolf') just says that the curse imposed by a person whose status is lower than that of the addressee does not will act, and we are talking about age, family-related, social status, and not about material issues. *It* ('dog') and *koy* ('sheep') in the mythological consciousness of Kazakhs are lower in hierarchy than *bori* ('wolf'), the totem animal of the ancient Turks. So, for example, in the eyes of Kazakhs, the curse of children against their parents or the younger in age against the elder may well have no power. But the curses of a father, mother or a respected elder – *aksakal* – have a very great magical power.

It is important to note that in the Kazakh speech culture there are some ways to respond to the curse with the help, firstly, of the formula for depriving the impact of the pronounced curse: *kargysyn kara taska!* ('Let your curse go to the black stone!' in the meaning of “Let your curse remain without consequences!”) (PDKL: 182) and, secondly, the formulas for the return of the curse, or the “boomerang” formula: *kargysyn kara basyna korinsin!* ('Let your curse fall on your black head!') (PDKL: 182). *Kara tas* ('a black stone') is the black stone of the Kaaba, sacred to Muslims, located in Mecca. It imprinted the human soul created by *Allakh*. Directing a curse from oneself to the sacred black stone, a person deprives him of the power of influence, thus protecting himself.

## Semantic Types of Curses

The analysis of the semantics of the kargys made it possible to identify several types of curses, taking into account the nature of the damage and harm directed at the cursed person: the wish for death; wish for illness and other physical damage (injuries, wounds); wishes for incapacity for work and disability; wish for misfortune, bad luck; wish for harm to the family and clan; desire for material damage.

- 1) The death wish.

The curse uses either the direct nomination *olim* ('death'), or the figurative expressions of *zhany shygu* ('a soul leaves'), *zhelken kiylu* ('turn the neck'), or stylistically reduced coarse colloquial verbs *aram katu* ('to croak'), *zhairap kalu* ('to die'): *Olim kelgir!* ('So that death overtakes you!') (PDKL: 289); *Zhelken kiylgyr!* ('May you turn your neck!') (PDKL: 110); *Aram katgyr!* ('May you die like a carrion!') (PDKL: 27). The noun *aram* is of Arabic origin and means "unclean, filthy (taboo, forbidden by the Muslim religion), defiled", has the mark religious in the dictionary (Bektaev, 2003: 51); see also: (Mashkhur-Zhusip, 1999: 205). The emergence of statements using this word, of course, refers to the time of the strengthening of Islam among the ancient Turks.

Often in *kargys*, a wish is expressed for the object to die young: *Kyrshynynnan kiylgyr!* ('You must die at a young age!') (PDKL: 207).

The curse may mention individual events, actions, objects related to the ritual of death – funeral, burial, commemoration, grave: *Kara sorpandy urttatgyr!* ('To be at your funeral!') (PDKL: 181); *Komusiz kalgyr!* ('Let you remain unburied!'). The designation of the funeral with the figurative expression *kara sorpa* ('black broth') is very specific and is associated with the funeral rite of the nomadic Turks, when an obligatory part of the ritual was the sacrifice of an animal, and then treating the participants with the funeral food *sorpa* – the broth of the sacrificial animal.

2) The wish for disappearance from the face of the earth, "vanishing", "taking away":

*Adyra kalgyr!* ('To make you disappear!') (DONKL: 10); *Saytan algyr!* ('Let the devil take you!'); *Tanir algyr!* ('May Tengri take you!') (PDKL: 30). Mystical and sacred forces that should contribute to the disappearance of a person are sometimes indicated directly (*saytan*, *Tanir*), but more often remain in the implicative sense of the statement. The archaism of *adyra* in the written ancient Turkic monuments means 'separation, parting, death' (Malov, 1959: 89).

Notable is the wish for the disappearance of not only the person himself, but even his name: *Atyn kurysyn!* ('Let your name disappear!') (PDKL: 37). From the point of view of the pagan animistic thinking of the proto-Kazakhs, at 'name' was considered as an integral part of a person, like any part of his body. With the death of a person, it had to go with him. The disappearance of a name could mean the death of a person or the physical loss of any part of his body.

3) The wish for illness, physical damage.

Among the diseases mentioned are *alapes* ('leprosy'), *kagyn* ('inflammation'), *kok tuinek* ('disease of children'), *kara talak* ('severe pain in the spleen'): *Kok tuinek bolgyr!* ('To make you sick') (PDKL: 150); *Alapeske ushragyr!* ('May you fall ill with leprosy!') (PDKL: 34). Physical injuries concern the most important and functionally significant parts of the body – *bet* ('a face'), *zhuz* ('a face'), *koz* ('eyes'), *til* ('a tongue'), *auyz* ('a mouth'), *zhagy* ('jaws'), *tamak* ('a throat'). It is they who turn out to be the most vulnerable from the point of view of the cursing: *Betin tilingir!* ('May your face be slashed!') (PDKL: 67); *Zhuzin kuigyr!* ('May your face be burned!') (PDKL: 119); *Kozin aksyn!* ('May your eyes run out!') (DONKL: 29); *Tilin kesilgyr!* ('May your tongue be cut!') (PDKL: 295); *Zhagyn karyskyr!* ('May your jaws clench!') (PDKL: 98); *Auzyna kum kuiylgyr!* ('May sand fall into your mouth!') (PDKL: 39); *Tamagyna tas tygylgyr!* ('May the stone get stuck in your throat!') (PDKL: 270). Such "special" attention to the tongue, mouth, jaws, pharynx, apparently due to the fact that they take a direct active part in the production of oral speech in a conflict situation, and the defeat of these parts is an attempt by the curser to silence the opposite side.

Among the internal organs, *ishi* ('stomach'), *buyrek* ('kidneys'), *ishegi* ('intestines') are mentioned: *Buyregin shykkyr!* ('May your kidneys come out!') (Baydullaeva & Aynabekov, 2018: 229); *Ishegin uzylgyr!* ('May your guts burst!') (PDKL: 323). The verbal predicates used in these curses are intensely destructive: *zharylu* ('to burst'), *uzylu* ('to burst') (Temirgazina, Albekova, & Kurmanova, 2021). Separately, we can single out the wish for damage to the mental health of a person: *Akylynnan adaskyr!* ('May you go crazy!') (PDKL: 19).

4) The wish for disability.

These statements mention the parts of the body, damage to which leads to injury, lameness, blindness – hands, feet, eyes: *Aiagyn askyr!* ('May you limp!') (DONKL: 27); *Kolyn syngyr!* ('May your arms break!') (Baydullaeva & Aynabekov 2018: 229). In the expression *Kolyn kotine zhetpegir!* which literally means 'So that your hands do not reach your ass!', the real situation of a person's inability to perform elementary actions is figuratively interpreted as a general disability. The expression takes on the meaning 'May you become disabled!'

5) The wish for misfortune, hunger, constant bad luck:

*Eki dunieden kyzyk kormegir!* ('So that you do not see happiness either in this or in the next world!'); *Bagyn ashylmasyn!* ('May bad luck accompany you!') (Baydullaeva & Aynabekov 2018: 228). The curse *Shashyn kesilsin!* ('Let your hair be cut off!') in the meaning of "Let your happiness be cut off / cut off the road to happiness!" is gender oriented. It is addressed only to women. The hair of the proto-Kazakhs has a sacred meaning: it cannot be burned, scattered anywhere, thrown into the trash, stepped on. Hair, according to popular belief, is strength, happiness, prosperity, success and good luck. Cutting off hair means "cutting off the road, your happiness." Girls' hair was cut once – when it was forty days from the date of birth. The curse of *Kara shashy zhayilsyn!* ('For you

to let your black hair down!") (PDKL: 181) is also addressed to women and girls and means 'So that someone close to you dies!' This expression is associated with the custom of letting down hair when mourning a loved one – a father, a husband, etc. Thus, the metaphorical form of expressing these curses is based on the cultural traditions that can be understood by a native speaker of another language and culture with the help of additional explanations and comments.

6) The wish for harm to the family and clan.

The curses contained a wish for the suppression of the clan: Ku bas kal! ('To remain lonely!') (PDKL: 194); Tukymyn kurgyr! ('May your seed perish!') (PDKL: 287). K. Urazaeva writes about the significance of such curses for the Kazakhs, since they have preserved the tribal way of life and tribal traditions from ancient times, the successors of which were children: "... The greatest sympathy for a person was associated with the absence of children. It is no coincidence that, according to the same logic, the most terrible curse among the Kazakhs is 'koktemegir!', literally "do not turn green", that is, not to have offspring" (Urazaeva, 2010: 5).

The same group includes wishes for death and misfortune to the family: Tundigin ashylmasyn! ('May your house not open!'); Katyn-bala shagan shulap kalgyr! ('May your children and wife be left unattended!') (Baydullaeva & Aynabekov 2018: 227). In addition to the children and wife, ata 'a father, a grandfather's is mentioned as an object in curses: Atana lagnet! ('May your father!') (DONKL: 26). G.Zh. Otemisova comments on these statements as follows: "A curse means that your father / grandfather will suffer and grieve endlessly. In Arabic, laugaton means 'grief, torment, suffering'" (DONKL: 26). In the ancient Turkic language, the noun ata unambiguously meant 'father', see (OTD: 71). In the Kazakh language, the word ata has expanded its meaning, compared to the ancient Turkic, and means 'a father' and 'a grandfather.'

7) The wish for material damage, poverty, deprivation of prosperity.

This semantic group of curses concerns mainly the main wealth of the Kazakh nomad – mal ('livestock'): Mal kormegir! ('Be without livestock!') (PDKL: 213). There are many idioms in the Kazakh language that testify to the importance of livestock: Mal ashuy – zhan ashu ('If the cattle disappears, a soul suffers') etc.

In a number of curses, the formal addressee is a variety of livestock (camels, sheep, cows, goats), which are sent to specific diseases: Sap bolgyr! ('Let the plague attack your cattle!'); Topalan bolgyr! ('Let the anthrax attack!'); Malik kelgir! ('Let the disease fall on the camels!') (Baidullaeva & Aynabekov 2018: 228); Bykpyrt tigr! ('Let the disease attack your sheep!') (PDKL: 704).

Less often, the wish for damage concerns other types of property – land, pastures, houses, household utensils: Orisindi ort algyr, zhailauyndy zhau algyr! ('So that your land is engulfed in fire, and your pastures are taken over by the enemy!') (PDKL: 241); Uiyin kuigir! ('May your house burn down!') (PDKL: 302); Kazanyyn kak aiyrlygyr! ('May your cauldron split in two!') (PDKL: 169).

The influencing perlocutionary, or "magical" power of curses is determined, in addition to the status relationship of the cursing subject and the addressee, as we said above, by an axiological factor. In other words, it depends on the place that the object of the curse (concept, object, etc.) occupies in the value picture of the world of the linguistic community. The higher the place of the object in the hierarchy of values, the stronger the perlocutionary effect of the impact on the addressee.

## CONCLUSION

Thus, the curse genre is a purely specific system of semantic-pragmatic, cultural-linguistic features that arose in the archaic consciousness of the ancient Turks and is a reflection of the mystical, pagan and religious views of a man on the surrounding reality. The curse refers to the destructive statements that violate the ecology of speech. The Kazakh curse kargys is a verbal pattern, the stable formulas of which are preserved in the minds of modern native speakers, although the archaic foundations of the pattern are not always recognized by them.

Actants in the propositional structure of the curse statement are optional and can be omitted for various semantic and pragmatic reasons. Only the predicate is obligatory because of its fundamental structural significance; it is preserved even in the truncated forms of the curse. An especially close connection with the mythology and religion of the ancient Turks is characterized by such an actant as an actor representing mystical and religious forces: Tanir ('Tengri'), aruak ('a spirit of ancestors'), saytan ('a devil'), albasty ('a female demon') etc. In addition, the object targeted by the curse is distinguished by a noticeable cultural specificity: at ('name'), mal ('livestock'). In the historical, cultural and formal linguistic terms, the Kazakh kargys retains the traces of the archaic mythological and religious views of the ancient Turks.

## Funding

This research "Linguoecology as a reflection of the ethno-cultural mentality of the inhabitants of Northern Kazakhstan (Akmola, Kostanay, Pavlodar regions)" was funded by the Science Committee of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan (Grant No. AP 19677795)

**Institutional Review Board Statement:** Not applicable.

**Transparency:** The author states that the manuscript is honest, truthful, and transparent, that no key aspects of the investigation have been omitted, and that any differences from the study as planned have been clarified. This study followed all writing ethics.

**Competing Interests:** The author declares that there are no conflicts of interests regarding the publication of this paper.

**Authors' Contributions:** All authors contributed equally to the conception and design of the study. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript

## Sources

EDTL = Blagova, G.F. (1997). Etymological dictionary of the Turkic languages. Moscow: "Languages of Russian Culture."

OTD = Old Turkic dictionary (2016). Nasilov, D.M., Kormushin, I.V. (eds). Astana: "Science" publishing house.

DONKL = Otemisova, G.Zh. (2012). Dictionary of obsolete names of the Kazakh language. Almaty: Kazakhinformation.

PDKL = Kenesbaev, I.K. (2007). Phraseological dictionary of the Kazakh language. Almaty: Kazakhinformation.

## REFERENCES

- Abisheva, K., Akosheva, M., Ayupova, G., Nurgazina A., Ayapbergenov B., and Baikadamova A. (2024). Modus Ethical Categories as a Condition for the Emergence of Phraseological Semantics, their Application in Political Discourse. *Space and Culture, India*, 12 (3), 171–188. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.20896/saci.v12i03.1520>
- Baydullaeva, R.Sh., Aynabekov, N.B. (2018). Good wishes and curses as a linguistic universal (contrastive-pragmatic analysis). *Bulletin of Science of South Kazakhstan*, 4 (4), 225–231. URL: <http://lib.ukgu.kz/images/2019/vestnik/vesnik-4.pdf>
- Baydauletova, N.R., Kenzhebaeva, A.A. (2016). Good wishes as a special genre of oral speech discourse (based on materials of the Kazakh and Chinese languages). *Bulletin of the KazNU named after al-Farabi. Oriental Studies Series*, 3 (78), 82–85. URL: <https://bulletin-orientalism.kaznu.kz/index.php/1-vostok/article/view/932/855>
- Balashova, L.V. (2017). Speech genres in Russian idiomatics (semantic and aspects). *Speech genres*, 1(15), 6–29. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18500/2311-0740-2017-1-15-6-29>
- Bektaev, K.B. (2003). Large Kazakh-Russian, Russian-Kazakh dictionary. Almaty: Alтын kazyna.
- Berezovich, E.L., Surikova, O.D. (2017). Towards the reconstruction of the lexical composition of Russian folk curses: general characteristics of the predicate of a curse. *Jezikoslovni zapiski*, 2 (23), 67–81. URL: [file:///C:/Users/user/Downloads/2017\\_\\_pdf](file:///C:/Users/user/Downloads/2017__pdf)
- Blank, Sh.H. (1950–1951). The Curse, Blasphemy, the Spell, and the Oath. *Hebrew Union College Annual*, 23(1), 73–95. URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23614777>
- Bopayuly, B. (2003). The blessings and curses of the Kazakh people. Almaty: Bastau.
- Ghimire, Sh. (2024). Role of Pedagogy in the Development and Vicissitude of Buddhism. *Space and Culture, India*. 12 (2), 116–131. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.20896/saci.v12i2.1336>
- Fensham, Ch. (1962). Salt as Curse in the Old Testament and the Ancient Near East. *The Biblical Archaeologist*, 25(2), 48–50.
- Jay, T. (2000). Why We Curse. A neuro-psycho-social theory of speech. Massachusetts, Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts, North Adams. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/z.91>
- Kaskabasov, S. A. (2009). Oyoris. Almaty: Publishing House «Zhibek Zholy», 303 p.
- Kratz, C.A. (1989). Genres of Power: A Comparative Analysis of Okiek Blessings, Curses and Oaths. *Man. New Series*, 24 (4), 636–656. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2307/2804292>
- Kryukova, I.V. (2011). The speech act of cursing and the lexical and grammatical means of its implementation. Abstract of a PhD thesis in Philology. Stavropol: Stavropol State University.
- Labov, W. (1972). Sociolinguistic Patterns. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500004528>

- Malov, S.E. (1959). Monuments of ancient Turkic writing of Mongolia and Kyrgyzstan. Moscow – Leningrad: Publishing House of the USSR Academy of Sciences. URL: <https://kazneb.kz/kk/bookView/view?brId=1650182>
- Mashkhur-Zhusip, K.P. (1999). Style and imagery in Kazakh lyrics. Pavlodar: Pavlodar University Publishing House.
- Mashkhur-Zhusip, K.P. (2000). The power of the artistic word. Pavlodar: EKO.
- Mashkhur-Zhusip, K.P. (2006). Continuity of realism in Kazakh lyrics. Bulletin of PSU. Philological series, 3, 75–88.
- Medvedeva, D.V., Deputatova, N.A. (2019). Speech act of cursing in English. Terra linguae, 5, 185–189. URL: <https://kpfu.ru/portal/docs/F619744558/Terra5.pdf>
- Ospan, B. (2017). Curse in Kazakh: teris bata — ‘reverse blessing’. URL: <https://365info.kz/2017/12/proklyatie-po-kazahski-teris-bata-blagoslovenie-naoborot> (date of access: 12.09.2025).
- Puértolas Rubio, L. (2022). Luwian Curses as Religious Discourse. *Altorientalische Forschungen*, 49(1), 138–147. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/aof-2022-0010>
- Temirgazina, Z. (2013). Effective Communicative Strategies and Tactics in Verbal Aggression Situations. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 24(6), 822–825. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5829/idosi.wasj.2013.24.06.13242>
- Temirgazina, Z., Albekova, A., Kurmanova, Z. (2021). One more time about the heart: naive anatomy in the Kazakh, Russian and English pictures of the World. *Przegląd Wschodnioeuropejski*, 12(2), 459–475. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31648/pw.6876>
- Temirgazina, Z., Rakhimzhanov, K., Akosheva, M., et al. (2022). Semiotics of family in Kazakh wedding toasts in the perspective of intercultural communication. *Metaphor and the Social World*, 12(2), 270–291 (22). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/msw.19019.tem>
- Tokarev, S.A. (ed.). (2008). *Myths of the Peoples of the World*. Moscow: Soviet Encyclopedia Publishing House. URL: [https://archive.org/details/Myths\\_of\\_the\\_Peoples\\_of\\_the\\_World\\_Encyclopedia\\_Electronic\\_publication\\_Tokarev\\_and\\_others\\_2008/page/n5/mode/2up](https://archive.org/details/Myths_of_the_Peoples_of_the_World_Encyclopedia_Electronic_publication_Tokarev_and_others_2008/page/n5/mode/2up) (date of access: 20.08.2025).
- Uakhatov, B. (1974). Kazakh folk poems. Алматы.
- Urazaeva, K. (2010). Name by signs. *Diapazon*. URL: <https://azh.kz/ru/news/view/4988> (date of access: 20.08.2025).
- Vinogradova, L.N. (2005). Formulas of threats and curses in Slavic conspiracies. In: *Conspiracy text: Genesis and structure*. Moscow: Indrik, 425–440.
- Vinogradova, L.N., Sedakova, I.A. (2009). Curse. In: N.I. Tolstoy (ed.). *Slavic Antiquities. Ethnolinguistic Dictionary*. Vol. 4. Moscow: International Relations, 286–296.