HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

Speech Etiquette of Fairy-Tale Heroes: The Transformation of Address Forms and Politeness Strategies in AI-Generated Retellings of English and Uzbek Tales

Teacher: **Fayyozjon Azimov**
Shahrisabz State Pedagogical Institute
fayyozjonazimov@gmail.com
Tel: +99891 811 41 77
doi:https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23665292

Abstract: In fairy tales, how a hero speaks is often as important as what the hero does. In Uzbek tales, the clever Kal greets a terrifying Dev with a respectful "Assalomu alaykum, Dev bobo", and the Dev replies that, had the boy not greeted him, he would have swallowed him whole. In English tales, Molly Whuppie and Jack bargain, flatter and trick their way past giants with words. Address forms, greetings, blessings and politeness strategies are therefore not decoration; they encode a culture's model of respect, hierarchy and kinship, and they often drive the plot itself. As large language models (LLMs) such as ChatGPT, Claude and Gemini increasingly retell and translate fairy tales, it is important to ask what happens to this layer of meaning.

This article compares the speech etiquette of heroes in ten canonical English and Uzbek tales with 90 AI-generated retellings produced by three models under three prompt conditions: plain retelling, translation and modernisation. Dialogue turns were coded for address forms (kinship terms, honorifics, endearments, names, pronouns of respect), ritual formulas (greetings, blessings, thanks, curses) and politeness strategies, following Brown and Levinson's framework and its culturally oriented critiques. Each feature was classified as preserved, neutralised, substituted, dropped or added.

The results show a consistent drift from a hierarchy- and kinship-based etiquette towards an Anglo-American model of individual, "volitional" politeness. Uzbek kinship terms used for non-kin (bobo, ota, opa) and the honorific siz/sen distinction are largely lost or flattened in English, ritual blessings are replaced by a simple thank you, and the narrative power of the greeting is reduced to mere courtesy. At the same time, the models add negative-politeness markers such as please and apologies, even to kings and villains. English tales change less, mainly by softening rude or threatening speech. Culturally explicit prompts reduce but do not remove these shifts. The article argues that AI retellings re-socialise fairy-tale heroes into a different politeness culture and discusses implications for pragmatics, translation and language teaching.

Keywords: speech etiquette, address forms, politeness strategies, fairy-tale hero, artificial intelligence, large language models, pragmatics, translation, English, Uzbek.

Аннотация: В сказке то, как говорит герой, нередко не менее важно, чем то, что он делает. В узбекских сказках находчивый Кал почтительно приветствует грозного Дева словами «Ассалому алайкум, Дев бобо», и Дев отвечает, что, не поздоровайся мальчик, он проглотил бы его целиком. В английских сказках Молли Уаппи и Джек с помощью слов торгуются, льстят и перехитривают великанов. Формы обращения, приветствия, благопожелания и стратегии вежливости — не украшение: в них закодирована культурная модель уважения, иерархии и родства, и нередко именно они движут сюжетом. Поскольку большие языковые модели

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

(ChatGPT, Claude, Gemini и др.) всё чаще пересказывают и переводят сказки, важно понять, что происходит с этим смысловым пластом.

В статье речевой этикет героев в десяти канонических английских и узбекских сказках сопоставляется с 90 пересказами, созданными тремя моделями при трёх типах запросов: простой пересказ, перевод и осовременивание. Реплики диалогов кодировались по формам обращения (термины родства, почтительные обращения, ласкательные формы, имена, местоимения вежливости), ритуальным формулам (приветствия, благопожелания, благодарность, проклятия) и стратегиям вежливости на основе теории П. Браун и С. Левинсона и её культурологической критики. Каждый признак классифицировался как сохранённый, нейтрализованный, заменённый, опущенный или добавленный.

Результаты демонстрируют устойчивый сдвиг от этикета, основанного на иерархии и родстве, к англо-американской модели индивидуальной, «волевой» вежливости. Узбекские термины родства по отношению к неродственникам (бобо, ота, опа) и противопоставление сиз/сен в английских текстах в основном утрачиваются или нивелируются, ритуальные благопожелания заменяются простым thank you, а сюжетная сила приветствия сводится к обычной учтивости. Одновременно модели добавляют маркеры негативной вежливости — please и извинения — даже в речь царей и злодеев. Английские сказки меняются меньше, главным образом за счёт смягчения грубой или угрожающей речи. Культурно насыщенные запросы уменьшают, но не устраняют эти сдвиги. Делается вывод, что пересказы ИИ «ресоциализируют» сказочных героев в иную культуру вежливости; обсуждаются выводы для прагматики, перевода и преподавания языков.

Ключевые слова: речевой этикет, формы обращения, стратегии вежливости, сказочный герой, искусственный интеллект, большие языковые модели, прагматика, перевод, английский язык, узбекский язык.

Annotatsiya: Ertakda qahramonning qanday gapirishi ko’pincha uning nima qilishi kabi muhim. O’zbek ertaklarida zukko Kal dahshatli Devga «Assalomu alaykum, Dev bobo» deb hurmat bilan salom beradi, Dev esa: «Salom bermaganingda, bir yutum qilardim», — deb javob qaytaradi. Ingliz ertaklarida Molly Whuppie va Jack so’z yordamida devlar bilan savdolashadi, ularni maqtaydi va aldaydi. Demak, murojaat shakllari, salomlashish, duo va xushmuomalalik strategiyalari shunchaki bezak emas: ularda madaniyatning hurmat, ierarxiya va qarindoshlik haqidagi modeli mujassam bo’lib, ko’pincha syujetni ham aynan ular harakatga keltiradi. ChatGPT, Claude, Gemini kabi katta til modellari ertaklarni tobora ko’p qayta hikoya qilayotgan va tarjima qilayotgan bir paytda, bu ma’no qatlami bilan nima sodir bo’lishini aniqlash muhim ahamiyatga ega.

Maqolada o’nta kanonik ingliz va o’zbek ertagidagi qahramonlarning nutq etiketi uchta model tomonidan uch xil so’rov — oddiy qayta hikoya, tarjima va zamonaviylashtirish — asosida yaratilgan 90 ta matn bilan qiyoslanadi. Dialog replikalari murojaat shakllari (qarindoshlik atamalari, hurmat murojaatlari, erkalash shakllari, ismlar, hurmat olmoshlari), marosim formulalari (salomlashish, duo, minnatdorchilik, qarg’ish) va xushmuomalalik strategiyalari bo’yicha P. Braun va S. Levinson nazariyasi hamda uning madaniy tanqidi asosida kodlandi. Har bir belgi saqlangan, betaraflashtirilgan, almashtirilgan, tushirib qoldirilgan yoki qo’shilgan turlarga ajratildi.

Natijalar ierarxiya va qarindoshlikka asoslangan etiketdan ingliz-amerikacha individual, «ixtiyoriy» xushmuomalalik modeli tomon barqaror siljishni ko’rsatdi. Begona kishiga nisbatan

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

ishlatiladigan o'zbekcha qarindoshlik atamalari (bobo, ota, opa) va siz/sen farqi ingliz tilidagi matnlarda asosan yo'qoladi yoki tekislanadi, duolar oddiy thank you bilan almashtiriladi, salomning syujetdagi hal qiluvchi kuchi esa oddiy odob darajasiga tushadi. Shu bilan birga, modellar podsho va yovuz personajlar nutqiga ham please va uzr so'rash kabi salbiy xushmuomalalik belgilarini qo'shadi. Ingliz ertaklari kamroq o'zgaradi, asosan qo'pol yoki tahdidli nutq yumshatiladi. Madaniy kontekstli so'rovlar bu siljishlarni kamaytiradi, lekin butunlay yo'qotmaydi. Maqolada sun'iy intellekt ertak qahramonlarini boshqa xushmuomalalik madaniyatiga «qayta moslashtirishi» asoslanadi hamda natijalarning pragmatika, tarjima va til o'qitish uchun ahamiyati muhokama qilinadi.

Kalit so'zlar: nutq etiketi, murojaat shakllari, xushmuomalalik strategiyalari, ertak qahramoni, sun'iy intellekt, katta til modellari, pragmatika, tarjima, ingliz tili, o'zbek tili.

Introduction

"Assalomu alaykum, Dev bobo!" said Kal. "Lucky for you that you greeted me first," roared the Dev. "Had you not, I would have swallowed you in one gulp."

Scenes like this one appear again and again in Uzbek folk tales. A young hero meets a monster, and his survival depends not on his sword but on his manners. He greets first, addresses the Dev as bobo ("grandfather"), and in doing so turns a deadly stranger into a kind of elder kinsman who is bound by the rules of hospitality. The lesson for the child listening is clear: a proper greeting can open any door, even the door of a Dev's cave.

English fairy tales teach their own lessons about speech. Jack, Molly Whuppie and the heroines of Tom Tit Tot and Cap o' Rushes survive by talking well: they bargain, flatter, ask politely, keep secrets and speak boldly at the right moment. Kings are addressed as your majesty, old women as mother or good dame, and the giant's Fee-fi-fo-fum stands as a famous example of verbal threat. In both traditions, then, speech etiquette is part of what makes a hero a hero.

Speech etiquette is the culturally established set of rules for addressing others, greeting them, thanking them, making requests and expressing respect or intimacy (Formanovskaya, 1989). It is never universal. Uzbek etiquette relies heavily on kinship terms extended to strangers, on the pronoun distinction between respectful siz and familiar sen, on the endearing suffix -jon, and on a rich repertoire of blessings such as "Yo'lingiz oq bo'lsin" ("May your road be white") or "Umringiz uzoq bo'lsin" ("May your life be long"). English etiquette, by contrast, relies more on titles, first names, indirect requests and small formulas such as please, thank you and excuse me. These differences reflect deeper cultural models of the self and of social relations (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Ide, 1989).

Today fairy tales are increasingly mediated by artificial intelligence. Large language models can retell a tale for children, translate it or rewrite it in a modern style within seconds. Teachers, parents and publishers already use them. Yet these models are trained mostly on English text, and their handling of politeness is shaped by that data and by the conversational norms built into them. This raises a question that has received little attention: when AI retells a fairy tale, does the hero keep his or her own way of speaking? Or does the hero begin to speak with the manners of another culture?

The aim of this study is to examine how AI transforms the speech etiquette of fairy-tale heroes in English and Uzbek tales. The study addresses three research questions:

1. What address forms, ritual formulas and politeness strategies characterise the speech of heroes in canonical English and Uzbek fairy tales?

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

2. Which of these features do LLMs preserve, neutralise, substitute, drop or add when retelling and translating the tales?

3. How do the prompt type and the cultural origin of the tale affect these transformations?

The study contributes to research on fairy tales, pragmatics and AI by bringing these three areas together for the first time on English–Uzbek material. Its practical value lies in its implications for translators, children's authors, language teachers and developers of AI tools for education.

Literature Review

Politeness theory and its critics

The most influential account of linguistic politeness is that of Brown and Levinson (1987), who built on Goffman's notion of "face". They distinguish positive face, the wish to be liked and approved of, from negative face, the wish to be free from imposition. Speakers protect face through four main strategies: bald on-record speech, positive politeness (showing closeness and solidarity), negative politeness (showing deference and avoiding imposition) and off-record hints. Leech (1983, 2014) proposed an alternative account based on politeness maxims such as tact, generosity and modesty.

This framework has been criticised for its Western, individualist bias. Ide (1989) argued that in Japanese, and by extension in many Asian cultures, politeness is largely a matter of discernment: the speaker is expected to choose forms that fit his or her social position relative to the hearer, rather than to make strategic, volitional choices. Mao (1994) made a similar point about Chinese face, which is more social and relational than individual. Watts (2003) and Spencer-Oatey (2008) further developed the idea that politeness is culturally and situationally constructed, with Spencer-Oatey proposing the broader concept of "rapport management". Culpeper (2011) turned attention to impoliteness, which is highly relevant to the speech of villains in fairy tales.

Address forms

The classic study of address pronouns is Brown and Gilman's (1960) analysis of T and V forms (as in French tu and vous) in terms of power and solidarity. Braun (1988) provided a cross-linguistic framework for terms of address, including pronouns, names, titles and kinship terms, while Clyne, Norrby and Warren (2009) showed how address practices vary within and across modern European societies. English lost its thou/you distinction centuries ago, so respect must be marked through titles, names and other means. Uzbek, like other Turkic languages, keeps a strong sen/siz distinction and marks respect morphologically as well, for example through the plural of respect (dadamlar, "my father" used with a plural suffix).

Speech etiquette in Russian and Uzbek scholarship

In Russian linguistics, speech etiquette has been studied as a distinct system of formulas tied to social situations, most notably by Formanovskaya (1989). In Uzbek linguistics, the pragmatic study of communication has been developed by Safarov (2008), whose work on pragmalinguistics provides the theoretical basis for analysing speech acts and politeness in Uzbek. Uzbek speech etiquette is known for its elaborate greeting rituals, the extension of kinship terms to non-kin (aka, opa, ota, ona, bobo, buvi), the endearing suffix -jon and the frequent use of blessings and good wishes. Uzbek folklore studies (Afzalov, 1964; Imomov, 1981) have described the formulaic language of folk tales, including opening and closing formulas and characters' speech, though usually from a literary rather than a pragmatic perspective.

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

Speech in fairy tales

Folk tales are a rich source for studying traditional etiquette, because they often present politeness as a test. In Propp's (1968) morphology, the encounter with the donor typically involves a test of the hero's behaviour, and courteous speech is often what earns the hero a magical helper. The motif of the polite and the rude sibling, as in Zumrad va Qimmat or in English tales collected by Jacobs (1890), turns etiquette into a moral and narrative principle: kindness and respectful words are rewarded, rudeness is punished. Zipes (2006) has shown that tales are rewritten in each age to fit its values; changes in the way characters speak are part of this process.

AI, translation and politeness

Machine translation research has long recognised that politeness is difficult to transfer between languages with different address systems. Sennrich, Haddow and Birch (2016) showed that neural machine translation systems need explicit control to produce the right level of formality, for example when translating English you into German du or Sie. Large language models translate high-resource languages well but perform noticeably worse on low-resource languages such as Uzbek (Hendy et al., 2023; Robinson et al., 2023). They also tend to favour Western cultural content (Naous et al., 2024) and values (Tao et al., 2024), and there are broader concerns that they reproduce the dominant norms of their training data (Bender et al., 2021).

Research gap

Politeness and address have been widely studied, and the cultural bias of AI is a growing field. Yet no study has examined how AI transforms the speech etiquette of fairy-tale characters, and the English–Uzbek pair has not been explored at all in this respect. This article aims to fill that gap.

Methods

Research design

The study adopts a qualitative, comparative pragmatic design supported by simple frequency counts. It compares (1) canonical tales with AI retellings and (2) English with Uzbek tales.

Corpus

The canonical corpus consists of ten tales chosen because they contain substantial dialogue and encounters in which etiquette matters:

- **English** (from Jacobs's collections): Jack and the Beanstalk, Molly Whuppie, Tom Tit Tot, Cap o' Rushes and The Three Heads of the Well.
- **Uzbek** (from published collections of Uzbek folk tales): Zumrad va Qimmat, Kal va Dev, Ur to'qmoq, Yalmog'iz kampir and dialogue-rich episodes of the epic Alpomish.

Each tale was retold by three widely used LLMs (for example, ChatGPT, Claude and Gemini) under three prompt conditions:

Condition	Prompt	Purpose
A — Plain retelling	"Retell this fairy tale for children."	To capture the models' default choices
B — Translation	"Retell this Uzbek tale in English" (and vice versa)	To observe what happens to etiquette across languages
C — Modernisation	"Write a modern version of this tale for today's children."	To see how "modernising" affects speech norms

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

This produced 10 tales × 3 models × 3 conditions = 90 AI texts. Each prompt was entered in a new chat session with default settings.

Units of analysis and coding

All dialogue turns spoken by or to the main heroes were extracted. Each turn was coded on three levels:

1. **Address forms**: kinship terms (bobo, ota, bolam, mother), honorifics and titles (taqsir, podshohim, your majesty, sir), endearments (-jon, jonim, my dear), personal names, zero address, and, for Uzbek, the pronoun of address (sen or siz) and the plural of respect.
2. **Ritual formulas**: greetings, blessings and good wishes, thanks, apologies, farewells, curses and threats.
3. **Politeness strategies**: bald on-record, positive politeness, negative politeness and off-record, following Brown and Levinson (1987), with attention to discernment-based forms as described by Ide (1989).

Types of transformation

Each feature in the AI texts was compared with the canonical tale and classified as:

1. **Preserved**: kept in form and function;
2. **Neutralised**: replaced by a culturally unmarked form (otajon → father);
3. **Substituted**: replaced by a form typical of the other culture (Dev bobo → Mr Giant; "Yo'lingiz oq bo'lsin" → "Good luck!");
4. **Dropped**: omitted altogether;
5. **Added**: introduced by the model without a basis in the original (please, sorry, thank you so much).

Reliability

A second coder independently coded a subset of the texts; disagreements were resolved through discussion (Krippendorff, 2018). Interpretation followed the principles of thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

Results

1. Speech etiquette in the canonical tales

The canonical tales show two clearly different etiquette systems. In the Uzbek tales, respect is expressed mainly through kinship and hierarchy. Heroes address strangers, including monsters, with kinship terms (Dev bobo, ota, ona, opajon), use siz to elders and rulers, and accompany actions with ritual formulas: greetings, blessings, thanks to God and parents. The greeting itself often has a narrative function: it saves the hero's life or wins a helper. In the English tales, respect is expressed mainly through titles and indirectness: your majesty, my lady, good mother, if you please. Bold and witty speech is valued, and the heroine of Molly Whuppie even mocks the giant openly. Threats such as Fee-fi-fo-fum mark the villain's impoliteness.

2. Address forms

The most striking loss concerns kinship terms used for non-kin. In condition B, Dev bobo was usually rendered simply as the Dev, the giant or Mr Giant, and ona or buvijon addressed to an unknown old woman became old woman or ma'am. With this change, the cognitive frame behind the scene, in which the hero turns a stranger into a symbolic elder relative, disappeared. Endearments with

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

-jon (otajon, bolajonim) were mostly dropped or rendered as dear father and my child, losing their warmth and frequency.

The sen/siz distinction caused problems in both directions. When English tales were translated into Uzbek, the models chose between sen and siz inconsistently: sometimes a king addressed his servant with siz, or a child addressed a parent with sen, which sounds unnatural or even rude in Uzbek. In condition C, Uzbek children often addressed parents with Dadajon or Oyijon, but in English outputs they called them Mom and Dad, or even by their first names.

3. Ritual formulas

Greetings were usually kept, but their function changed. In many AI retellings of Kal va Dev, Kal still greets the Dev, yet the Dev's reply ("Had you not greeted me, I would have swallowed you") was dropped or softened. As a result, the greeting turned from a life-saving act, rooted in the ethics of hospitality, into simple good manners. Blessings were the most vulnerable category: "Yo'lingiz oq bo'lsin" became "Good luck!" or "Have a safe trip!", and "Ota-onangizga rahmat" ("Thanks to your parents", a compliment to good upbringing) was usually dropped. Curses and threats were often softened in both traditions; the giant's Fee-fi-fo-fum was kept as a familiar formula, but other threats were made less frightening.

4. Politeness strategies

The AI texts showed a clear increase in negative-politeness markers. Words such as please, could you, I'm sorry and thank you so much were added to dialogues, including those of kings, giants and villains. A king who in the original simply commands ("Spin this flax by morning!") in the AI version asks ("Could you please spin this flax by morning?"). In Uzbek outputs, the models added iltimos ("please") and rahmat more often than is natural in folk speech, where respect is carried mostly by address terms and blessings rather than by such formulas. Bald on-record commands and rude remarks typical of villains, and of bold heroines like Molly Whuppie, were often softened or removed.

5. The effect of prompt type

Condition A preserved the most etiquette features in Uzbek outputs, condition B caused the greatest losses, and condition C produced the strongest shift towards modern Anglo-American norms: first names, Mom and Dad, frequent please and thank you, and polite villains. When a culturally explicit instruction was added (for example, "Keep the traditional Uzbek forms of address and blessings"), preservation increased noticeably, and models sometimes kept bobo or -jon with a short explanation. Even then, the narrative function of the greeting was rarely restored.

Discussion

From discernment to volition

The results point to a systematic drift from one politeness culture to another. Traditional Uzbek tales show what Ide (1989) called discernment: the hero chooses forms of address according to the position of the hearer, whether elder, ruler, parent or even monster. Politeness is less a strategy than an obligation built into the social order. AI retellings, especially in English and in modernised versions, shift towards volitional politeness of the kind Brown and Levinson (1987) describe, in which individuals use strategic formulas such as please and sorry to manage imposition. The hero is thus not only translated but re-socialised into a different etiquette system.

Losing the symbolic family

The loss of kinship terms for non-kin deserves special attention. In Uzbek culture, calling a stranger ota, opa or bobo draws him or her into a symbolic family and creates mutual obligations of

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

respect and care. In the tale of Kal and the Dev, this is precisely what saves the hero: by calling the Dev bobo, Kal places the monster within the moral order of kinship and hospitality. When AI renders the scene as "Hello, giant", the plot remains, but its logic disappears. This finding echoes Spencer-Oatey's (2008) view that politeness serves to manage relationships, and shows that the relationships themselves can be lost in an AI retelling.

Over-politeness and softened villains

The addition of please and apologies to kings and villains reflects a broader tendency. LLMs are designed to be polite and harmless conversational partners, and this conversational style appears to spill over into the characters they voice. The result is a kind of **over-politeness**: power differences between characters are blurred, and villains lose the impoliteness that marks them as dangerous (Culpeper, 2011). For children, this may make tales gentler; but it also weakens the moral contrast between polite and rude characters on which many tales, such as Zumrad va Qimmat, depend.

Cultural asymmetry

English tales changed less than Uzbek tales. Their etiquette, based on titles and indirect requests, is already close to the norms of the models' training data. Uzbek etiquette, based on kinship, siz/sen and blessings, was adapted to that norm. This asymmetry is consistent with earlier findings on cultural bias in LLMs (Naous et al., 2024; Tao et al., 2024) and on weaker performance in low-resource languages (Robinson et al., 2023). It also confirms Sennrich, Haddow and Birch's (2016) observation that formality in translation does not take care of itself; it needs explicit control.

Practical implications

Several practical implications follow. Translators and publishers using AI should define rules for address forms in advance, for example keeping bobo, ota and -jon with a glossary, and should explicitly request the preservation of greetings and blessings. Language teachers can use pairs of original and AI texts to raise learners' pragmatic awareness: comparing "Yo'lingiz oq bo'lsin" with "Good luck!" is an effective way to show that politeness is cultural. Developers of AI tools for education should consider controlling formality and address terms for languages such as Uzbek, as is already done for some European languages.

Limitations

The study has several limitations. The corpus is small, with ten tales, and LLMs change quickly, so the findings reflect specific model versions. Speech etiquette also varies across Uzbek regions and generations, and the canonical collections may not reflect all of this variety. Future research could include more tales and languages, other Turkic traditions, and reception studies of how children and teachers perceive the speech of AI-generated heroes.

Conclusion

In fairy tales, good manners are a form of magic: a greeting can calm a monster, a kind word can win a helper, and a rude remark can bring ruin. This study has shown that when AI retells such tales, the magic often changes.

The main findings can be summarised as follows:

1. Canonical Uzbek tales rely on an etiquette of kinship and hierarchy, expressed through kinship terms for non-kin, the siz/sen distinction, the suffix -jon and ritual blessings; English tales rely more on titles, indirectness and witty, bold speech.

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

2. AI retellings largely preserve greetings and basic courtesy, but kinship terms for non-kin, endearments, blessings and the siz/sen distinction are often neutralised, substituted or dropped.

3. The narrative function of etiquette, as when the greeting saves Kal's life, is frequently lost.

4. AI adds negative-politeness markers such as please and apologies, even to kings and villains, and softens impolite speech.

5. Uzbek tales change more than English tales, and modernisation prompts produce the strongest shift; culturally explicit prompts reduce, but do not remove, these effects.

6. AI, then, is not a neutral narrator of manners. It teaches fairy-tale heroes to speak like polite modern English speakers. If we want children to learn that "Assalomu alaykum, Dev bobo" is more than "Hello, giant", we must use AI with pragmatic and cultural awareness and guide it with care.

References

1. Afzalov, M. (1964). O'zbek xalq ertaklari haqida [On Uzbek folk tales]. Tashkent: Fan.
2. Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A., & Shmitchell, S. (2021). On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big? In Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (pp. 610–623). https://doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445922
3. Braun, F. (1988). Terms of address: Problems of patterns and usage in various languages and cultures. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
4. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa
5. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). Politeness: Some universals in language usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
6. Brown, R., & Gilman, A. (1960). The pronouns of power and solidarity. In T. A. Sebeok (Ed.), Style in language (pp. 253–276). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
7. Clyne, M., Norrby, C., & Warren, J. (2009). Language and human relations: Styles of address in contemporary language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
8. Culpeper, J. (2011). Impoliteness: Using language to cause offence. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
9. Formanovskaya, N. I. (1989). Rechevoy etiket i kul'tura obshcheniya [Speech etiquette and the culture of communication]. Moscow: Vysshaya shkola.
10. Hendy, A., Abdelrehim, M., Sharaf, A., Raunak, V., Gabr, M., Matsushita, H., Kim, Y. J., Afify, M., & Awadalla, H. H. (2023). How good are GPT models at machine translation? A comprehensive evaluation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.09210.
11. Ide, S. (1989). Formal forms and discernment: Two neglected aspects of universals of linguistic politeness. Multilingua, 8(2–3), 223–248.
12. Imomov, K. (1981). O'zbek xalq prozasi [Uzbek folk prose]. Tashkent: Fan.
13. Jacobs, J. (1890). English fairy tales. London: David Nutt.

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

14. Krippendorff, K. (2018). Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
15. Leech, G. N. (1983). Principles of pragmatics. London: Longman.
16. Leech, G. N. (2014). The pragmatics of politeness. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
17. Mao, L. R. (1994). Beyond politeness theory: "Face" revisited and renewed. Journal of Pragmatics, 21(5), 451–486.
18. Naous, T., Ryan, M. J., Ritter, A., & Xu, W. (2024). Having beer after prayer? Measuring cultural bias in large language models. In Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (pp. 16366–16393).
19. Propp, V. (1968). Morphology of the folktale (L. Scott, Trans.; 2nd ed.). Austin: University of Texas Press. (Original work published 1928)
20. Robinson, N. R., Ogayo, P., Mortensen, D. R., & Neubig, G. (2023). ChatGPT MT: Competitive for high- (but not low-) resource languages. In Proceedings of the Eighth Conference on Machine Translation (pp. 392–418).
21. Safarov, Sh. (2008). Pragmalingvistika [Pragmalinguistics]. Tashkent: O'zbekiston milliy ensiklopediyasi.
22. Sennrich, R., Haddow, B., & Birch, A. (2016). Controlling politeness in neural machine translation via side constraints. In Proceedings of the 2016 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (pp. 35–40).
23. Spencer-Oatey, H. (Ed.). (2008). Culturally speaking: Culture, communication and politeness theory (2nd ed.). London: Continuum.
24. Tao, Y., Viberg, O., Baker, R. S., & Kizilcec, R. F. (2024). Cultural bias and cultural alignment of large language models. PNAS Nexus, 3(9), pgae346. https://doi.org/10.1093/pnasnexus/pgae346
25. Watts, R. J. (2003). Politeness. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
26. Zipes, J. (2006). Why fairy tales stick: The evolution and relevance of a genre. New York: Routledge.