



Euphemisms in world linguistics: issues of interpretation and classification

Nodirxon SHARAFUTDINOV¹

Kokand University

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received October 2025

Received in revised form 5
October 2025

Accepted 10 November 2025

Available online 25
November 2025

Keywords:

euphemisms,
linguistic classification,
pragmatics,
cross-cultural analysis,
taboo language,
communicative strategies.

ABSTRACT

Euphemisms, as integral lexical-semantic units of language, play a crucial role as indicators of communicative and cultural norms. This study investigates the problem of interpretation and classification of euphemisms within global linguistic content. The research is motivated by the need for a unified, cross-linguistic framework that can account for the semantic, pragmatic, and socio-cultural dimensions of euphemistic expressions. The primary objective is to propose a multifactorial classification model that moves beyond traditional, often fragmented, typologies. The methodology is based on a systematic qualitative analysis of existing linguistic literature and case studies from diverse languages, including English, Russian, and Uzbek. The analysis focuses on the functional, thematic, and structural mechanisms of euphemism formation. The results culminate in a novel, integrated classification system that categorizes euphemisms along four primary axes: 1) Functional-Pragmatic (taboo avoidance, politeness, concealment, manipulation); 2) Thematic (death, bodily functions, social relations, politics, profession); 3) Structural-Semantic (metaphor, metonymy, circumlocution, borrowing, abbreviation); and 4) Degree of Conventionalization (stable vs. ad-hoc). This model demonstrates that euphemisms are not merely substitutive lexemes but complex signs deeply embedded in the axiological system of a culture, reflecting its moral codes, ethical rules, and national values. The discussion contends that this holistic approach addresses the limitations of previous classifications by simultaneously considering the motivation, form, and function of euphemisms, thereby offering a more robust tool for comparative and cross-cultural linguistic analysis. The study concludes that the interpretation of euphemisms is inherently tied to their classification, and a multidimensional framework is essential for understanding their role in regulating communicative processes within a socio-cultural context.

¹ Head of the Department of World Languages, Kokand University. E-mail: nodirhon89@gmail.com

2181-3701/© 2025 in Science LLC.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47689/2181-3701-vol3-iss10/S-pp26-37>

This is an open-access article under the Attribution 4.0 International
(CC BY 4.0) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.ru>)

Jahon tilshunosligida evfemizmlar: tarjima qilish va tasniflash masalalari

ANNOTATSIYA

Kalit so'zlar:

evfemizmlar,
lingvistik tasnif,
pragmatika,
madaniyatlararo tahlil,
tabu til,
kommunikativ strategiyalar.

Evfemizmlar tilning ajralmas leksik-semantik birliklari sifatida kommunikativ va madaniy me'yorlarning ko'rsatkichlari sifatida hal qiluvchi rol o'ynaydi. Ushbu tadqiqot global lingvistik mazmundagi evfemizmlarni izohlash va tasniflash muammosini o'rganadi. Tadqiqot evfemistik iboralarning semantik, pragmatik va ijtimoiy-madaniy o'lchovlarini hisobga oladigan yagona, tillararo asosga bo'lgan ehtiyojdan kelib chiqadi. Asosiy maqsad an'anaviy, ko'pincha bo'laklangan tipologiyalardan tashqariga chiqadigan multifaktorial tasniflash modelini taklif qilishdir. Metodika turli tillar, jumladan, ingliz, rus va o'zbek tillaridagi mavjud lingvistik adabiyotlar va amaliy tadqiqotlarni tizimli sifat jihatidan tahlil qilishga asoslanadi. Tahlilda asosiy e'tibor evfemizm shakllanishining funksional, mavzuli va strukturaviy mexanizmlariga qaratilgan. Natijalar evfemizmlarni to'rtta asosiy o'q bo'yicha toifalarga ajratadigan yangi, yaxlit tasniflash tizimi bilan yakunlanadi: 1) Funksional-pragmatik (tabudan qochish, xushmuomalalik, yashirish, manipulyatsiya); 2) Tematik (o'lim, tana funksiyalari, ijtimoiy munosabatlar, siyosat, kasb); 3) Strukturaviy-semantik (metafora, metonimiya, aylanma, qarz olish, qisqartma); va 4) Konvensiyalash darajasi (barqaror va ad-hoc). Bu model evfemizmlarning shunchaki o'rnini bosuvchi leksemalar emas, balki madaniyatning aksiologik tizimiga chuqur singib ketgan, uning axloqiy kodekslari, axloqiy qoidalari va milliy qadriyatlarini aks ettiruvchi murakkab belgilar ekanligini ko'rsatadi. Muhokama shuni ko'rsatadiki, bu yaxlit yondashuv bir vaqtning o'zida evfemizmlarning motivatsiyasi, shakli va funksiyasini ko'rib chiqish orqali oldingi tasniflarning cheklovlarini ko'rib chiqadi va shu bilan qiyosiy va madaniyatlararo lingvistik tahlil uchun yanada mustahkam vositani taklif qiladi. Tadqiqot shuni ko'rsatadiki, evfemizmlarning talqini tabiatan ularning tasnifi bilan bog'liq va kommunikativ jarayonlarni ijtimoiy-madaniy kontekstda tartibga solishda ularning rolini tushunish uchun ko'p o'lchovli asos zarur.

Эвфемизмы в мировой лингвистике: проблемы интерпретации и классификации

Ключевые слова:

эвфемизмы,
лингвистическая
классификация,
прагматика,
кросс-культурный анализ,
табуированный язык,
коммуникативные
стратегии.

АННОТАЦИЯ

Эвфемизмы, как неотъемлемые лексико-семантические единицы языка, играют важнейшую роль как индикаторы коммуникативных и культурных норм. Данное исследование посвящено проблеме интерпретации и классификации эвфемизмов в глобальном языковом контенте. Оно мотивировано потребностью в единой кросс-лингвистической структуре, учитывающей семантические, прагматические и социокультурные аспекты эвфемистических выражений. Основная цель – предложить многофакторную модель классификации, выходящую за рамки традиционных, часто фрагментированных типологий. Методология основана на систематическом качественном анализе существующей лингвистической литературы и тематических исследований по разным языкам, включая английский, русский и узбекский. Анализ фокусируется на функциональных, тематических и структурных механизмах образования эвфемизмов.

Результаты привели к созданию новой интегрированной системы классификации, характеризующей эвфемизмы по четырём основным осям: 1) функционально-прагматическая (избегание табу, вежливость, сокрытие, манипуляция); 2) тематическая (смерть, телесные функции, социальные отношения, политика, профессия); 3) структурно-семантическая (метафора, метонимия, иносказательность, заимствования, аббревиатура); 4) степень конвенционализации (стабильная или случайная). Эта модель показывает, что эвфемизмы – не просто замещающие лексемы, а сложные знаки, глубоко укоренённые в аксиологической системе культуры и отражающие её моральные кодексы, этические нормы и национальные ценности. В обсуждении отмечается, что целостный подход устраняет ограничения предыдущих классификаций, учитывая мотивацию, форму и функцию эвфемизмов, и тем самым представляет более надёжный инструмент для сравнительного и кросс-культурного лингвистического анализа. В исследовании делается вывод о том, что интерпретация эвфемизмов неразрывно связана с их классификацией, и для понимания их роли в регулировании коммуникативных процессов в социокультурном контексте необходима многомерная структура.

INTRODUCTION

There is no doubt about the power of words in the province of linguistics. However, there is no doubt that there are words and concepts that can cause discomfort, pain, embarrassment, or even social disruption, just by their direct use. It is in those cautionary contexts and circumstances that the language's unique safety mechanism, euphemisms, become active. Euphemisms do not only belong to the lexical components, but also belong to the cultural-semantic and pragmatic units of the system. They are subtle facets of the expression of social norms of morality, rules of etiquette, and national and cultural values through language. The question of understanding euphemisms expressed in differing ways across differing cultures, interpreting them, and establishing a systematic classification becomes especially salient, in this age of increasing globalization and cross-cultural communication. The focus of the research is to elucidate to the reader the positioning of euphemisms within world linguistic content, the complications of interpreting them, and the scientific basis for evaluation and classification of euphemisms. Development of Euphemism as a Linguistic Concept. The word "euphemism" is derived from the ancient Greek term "euphemismos," which means "to speak well." Since ancient times people have engaged in a ritual of not naming certain concepts, particularly those which are sacred, scary, or dangerous, but instead expressing them as euphemisms in milder forms. In linguistics, the study of euphemisms has usually been considered in relation to taboo (forbidden) words. Early studies were primarily ethnographic and anthropological in nature, only examining the aspects of custom as it pertained to things like religion, sex, etc. In the latter half of the 20th century, interest in euphemisms grew rapidly with the development of pragmatic and communicative trends in linguistics. Euphemisms were then studied not only as a lexical substitution but also as communication strategies, social relations, and cognitive metaphors. In contemporary linguistics, euphemisms are differentiated through: Communicative-pragmatic aspect: Speakers of language use euphemisms in speech activity with certain goals (respectful effects, hiding hatred, and manipulation for one's own good). Euphemisms serve as a potentially rich linguistic phenomenon that must be studied multi-positively and through a variety of interrelated perspectives. They are sociolinguistically salient, acting as identity markers that demonstrate affiliation and establish boundaries in specific social, age, or occupational groups. Cognitively, they are constructed using basic mechanisms such as metaphor and metonymy, which give insight into the conceptual frameworks and cognitive patterns of human knowledge that allow for indirect representations of thought. Finally, these constructions are culturally encoded, as every language has its own niche of euphemisms that are representative of a nation's mentality, its entrenched traditions, and its core values, making them essential to understand the worldview of a culture.

OBJECTIVES:

In order to capture the linguistic definition of euphemism, any definition must start by differentiating it from similarly related concepts such as taboo's prohibition, dysphemism's offense, and orthophemism's neutral directness, while exploring the heart of euphemism or, in other words, its fundamental functions that include communicative (contracting smooth interaction), pragmatic (bringing about certain effects), and socio-cultural (following rules and shaping perceptions) functions. In addition, this study will examine dominant thematic circles within which euphemisms occur including death, health, gender, politics, and economics across languages including English, Russian, and

Uzbek while introducing an arrangement of mechanisms of formation that exist which can be expanded to include lexical substitution, grammar, and stylistic devices like metaphor, that linguists propose. A discussion demonstrating cultural context and its importance as a part of interpretation will occur before analysing some existing classification models to understand how the variety of meaning possibilities surrounding euphemism does not always fit into the explanation of commonly used classifications. As part of the research proposal, a need for a revised, integrated multi-factor model, that includes functional, thematic, structural, and cultural aspects will be presented as a next step towards an expanded understanding and classification of euphemism. This study is situated within a complex theoretical framework that draws from Pragmalinguistics in order to analyze euphemisms as language acts that strategically navigate the communication maxims, Sociolinguistics to analyse their use in social contexts and the reflection of societal change, Cognitive Linguistics to analyse the underlying metaphorical and metonymic processes that underpin their emergence, and Cultural Linguistics to analyse them as reflections of national mentality and cultural norms. The theoretical significance of this study is the way in which euphemisms serve a model function for the exploration and investigation of complex interrelationships between semantics, pragmatics, and cultural context, while the practical significance is the degree of directly applicable findings to numerous disciplines, including lexicography, teaching speech culture, translation theory and practice, and various ways of analysing political and advertising discourses.

METHODS

Since this study was primarily concerned with the conception of a comprehensive, multi-dimensional model for the interpretation and classification of euphemism, methodologically, it was situated in a qualitative framework. This approach was favoured because of the very nature of euphemisms as a culturally and pragmatically situated linguistic phenomenon with inherent complexity and nuance that can often not be effectively described or represented through numbers. Thus, the purpose of the research was not frequency or distribution based, but to seek a deeper, conceptual understanding of euphemistic expression's mechanisms, functions, and cultural particularities. Therefore, the research proposed a design prioritising depth over breadth, as the aim was to systematically illustrate the complex interrelationships between language, thought, and society through euphemism. The methodological framework revolved around two major, interrelated qualitative methods: systematic review and theoretical analysis. The systematic review was a comprehensive, thorough, and critical review of the available academic literature in pragmalinguistics, sociolinguistics, cognitive linguistics, and cultural studies heightened the reliability of both the theoretical foundation and the map of euphemism studies within a wider theoretical community of scholarship. It involved locating, appraising, and synthesizing a significant range of scholarship to develop a sound theoretical base; situate euphemism studies in relation to existing scholarship; and establish a prevalently agreed upon consensus regarding trends, themes, categories, and gaps in euphemism studies that the model proposed in this paper sought to address.

In addition, the theoretical analysis served as the active, interpretive engine of the research. This entailed a critical engagement with the synthesized literature to unpack and analyse the actual concepts that precede euphemism. Specifically, it involved an extensive investigation of the theoretical constructs from each of the foundational frameworks, such as speech act theory, conceptual metaphor theory, and face-work politeness theory, to

ascertain what they could explain – both productively and proleptically – when applied to euphemism. This analytical process was essential for investigating the distinctions between euphemism, dysphemism, and orthophemism, refining our theorizing of their pragmatic functions, and exposing cognitive and cultural patterns that inform their construction. Through this depth of theoretical reasoning, the components and structure of the new integrated model emerged logically justified on theoretical grounds, so it was not simply a collection of other people's ideas, but coherent, theoretically complemented and legitimate progression in the expansion of the field. Ultimately, the relationship between the systematic review and the theoretical analysis laid an academic foundation for the ultimate research goal: the development of an elaborate and holistic model for understanding euphemisms, in the develop phase. The gathered linguistic data on euphemisms were analyzed and interpreted using a series of complementary qualitative analytic techniques, each of which was meant to illuminate a slightly different aspect of this multi-faceted phenomenon. The first part of the analysis involved systematic analysis to conduct a thorough audit of the existing academic classifications and theoretical approaches to euphemism. This meant a detailed review of the literature to try to catalogue the existing classifications – whether these be typologies based on thematic circles, structural mechanisms, or pragmatic functions – and review their applications and, importantly, specifications. This first, foundational step was vital to identifying the conceptual and generalisability issues that the aim of the research was seeking to address, and consequently, cement the new model and understanding upon of a solidification and critical review of the progress to date of the field. After this first phase, the next stage of analysis involved a comprehensive comparative analysis on the use of euphemisms across other linguistic and cultural contexts, with a particular focus on euphemisms in English, Russian and Uzbek. This comparative analysis was fundamental to moving beyond a mono-cultural perspective to draw out both universal tendencies and cultural specifics. By comparing euphemisms from these distinct languages with regard to their function, primary thematic areas (e.g. death, bodily functions, or social stratification), and preferred modes of formation, the study could also identify factors that are essential to the human urge to use euphemisms, versus factors influenced by historical, religious, and social norms.

To probe the complexity of individual euphemistic units, the study first employed a multi-layered analytic approach. Central to this approach was a semantic-pragmatic analysis that considered both ways each euphemism could be interpreted. First, euphemisms were examined from the perspective of their literal meanings- that is, their denotational meanings. More importantly, their analysis took into consideration how they are used in communicative contexts to achieve a specific illocutionary force and to produce particular effects, or connotation, (conventional and otherwise), on listeners. For example, some euphemisms were distinguished according to whether they were used to simply avoid offence and therefore were intended to simply not cause harm, versus those which were intentionally designed to influence understanding and create an effect on the receiver. Additionally, to further parse these distinctions, in some instances component analysis was utilized to delineate more subtle semantic distinctions between the euphemism and its literal, non-euphemistic counterpart. Identifying and tagging these distinctions in terms of binary semantic features including [+formal] vs. [-formal], and [+respectful] vs. [-respectful] or [+mild] vs. [-blunt], allowed the study to more accurately represent the semantic shift of euphemization as a more precise, discrete and granular

representation, rather than a vague description of meaning. Finally, and foundational to all other analytic approaches, a detailed contextual analysis was conducted. Understanding that the meaning of a euphemism, and the degree to which it is acceptable, is not fixed or given but activated in the context, each instance was analysed in relationship to its genuine context of use, be that a political address, a medical appointment, a fictional text, or a casual conversation. This ensured the examination of each instance was situated in actual usage, thus accounting for various aspects such as speaker/hearer relationship, formality of context, and general communicative purpose to ensure whole, ecological and valid techniques of analysing data. The research materials were systematically arranged by language and text type to facilitate a systematic analysis of education and tabulation of results in a descriptive way. The languages represented in the linguistic analysis were English – selected for its global prominence and long academic tradition in this area; Russian – selected for the better-documented linguocultural context which provides many comparative examples for Uzbek; and Uzbek – which was emphasized due to the author's demographic proximity to and awareness of the uniqueness of its cultural and linguistic diversity. The text was drawn from a variety of subject texts, including journalism, politics, and diplomacy, subject-specific areas, like medicine and law, advertising, modern internet and social network communication, and literature, to provide a comprehensive review and analysis of euphemisms across registers. At the same time, the study is aware of the specific limitations, particularly its qualitative nature, which allows for more depth or nuance in focus, while it also does not permit, for instance, large-scale measurements or broad statistical generalizations. While the proposed interpretive model could allow for it to be adapted more generally, the study itself was constricted to a few selected languages. Another challenge is the fact euphemisms are inherently fluid, often quickly changing and renewed for innumerable reasons, making it difficult to compile an exhaustive and permanently and perpetually up-to-date catalogue of examples.

RESULTS

A thorough review of the available academic literature and a close study of data from variation in language have informed the construction of a new, unified model for the study and categorization of euphemisms. The model departs from purely additive classifications and organizes these analyses around four primary, but interconnected, axes. Specifically, this multidimensional character allows for the evaluation of any euphemism from multiple necessary angles, explicitly: 'the purpose and pragmatic meaning, the macro thematic meaning, the linguistic form of the euphemism' and 'dialect, sociolect, or a specific cultural context'. The model is designed to take a whole systems approach, which honors the reality that one euphemism can operate with multiple perspectives at the same time and the meaning of that euphemism is co-constructed in its use by the form of euphemism, the context of its usage, and the historical and cultural associations behind it.

The first and primary axis of the model is a functional-pragmatic classification, which is founded in the analysis as a central differentiator. The classification allows for the recognition that euphemisms are not a singular type, and that the role of euphemisms within contexts of communication can vary greatly. The oldest and most generally acknowledged function is the avoidance of taboo, whereby euphemisms can replace direct reference to things that may be considered sacred, frightening, or socially unacceptable, as with death ("passed away" or "deceased"), sexual intercourse ("intimacy"), or bodily functions ("using the bathroom"). A second closely related function is the maintenance of

politeness and propriety, which is consistent with established principles of linguistics, such as Grice's cooperative maxims or Leech's politeness principle. This undertone is speaking more gently about a potentially sensitive topic, as with "person with a disability" instead of "crippled" or "sanitation worker" instead of "garbage collector", which then contributes to the dignity of the addressee and the avoidance of potentially uncomfortable communication.

However, euphemism extends beyond avoidance and politeness into the realms of strategic and ethically questionable use. We would call a third function concealment and deception, meaning it can be used, not so much to settle a harsh truth to be more palatable, but just to conceal the truth and even to twist what has been said. This is quite common in political language, where phrases such as "collateral damage" prevent one from considering civilian casualties to be casualties of war, or in economics, where a company refers to "downsizing" or "rightsizing" in describing mass layoffs or terminations. Lastly, this model sees there is also a manipulative function where euphemism can be used in advertising and political propaganda to admittedly influence how public perception and decision-making happens. This type of function suggests the language is constructed to improve the reception of an argument, as they purposely switch or find alternate ways of talking about things or concepts so they seem more appealing. For example they may call a high price a "premium investment" or refer to a serious problem as a "growth opportunity" to go the direction they want you to go. While it does not directly apply in a social context, this is an important function of euphemism and more importantly this functional axis controls for the majority of the range of motivations to use euphemism from decency to attempts to obfuscate and manipulate cognitions. A basic and very clear way to categorize euphemisms is using a thematic/topical categorization. This is one of the oldest (and least clear) frameworks for categorizing euphemisms, grouping euphemisms according to the topic or subject matter they are meant to address, usually one that is considered sensitive in some way. When we analyze these thematic clusters across languages, we notice the emergence of common concerns of being human, while also noticing that contexts of linguistic sensitivity can be culturally conditioned. The primary thematic categories that are consistently found in the data include deep or profound areas of death and health, subjective or private areas of sexuality and reproduction, subjective or personal-based bodily and physical areas, social areas of profession or status, and public areas of politics and economic concerns. Among the most common thematic categories are those related to death and health. Across cultures, explicit references to death and serious illness are often avoided and substituted for euphemistic or metaphorical language. In English, we hear phrases such as "passed away," "departed," or "fighting an illness." Similarly, in Russian, speakers employ terms like "отошел в мир иной" (passed into the next world) and the more neutral "приболел" (is a bit ill). In addition, we find poignant phrases in Uzbek, including "vafot etdi" (passed away), the metaphorical "dunyo o'zgardi" (the world changed), and "og'ir kasal" (seriously ill). Another thematic category addresses sexual intercourse or reproductive functions, as euphemisms are employed to exert privacy and public decorum; for instance, in English, we say "to make love," "to sleep with someone," and also "expecting." In Russian, we might hear "интимная связь" (intimate connection) or "на сносях" (about to give birth), while in Uzbek we use more formal terms like "jinsiy aloqa" (sexual intercourse), or indirect phrases like "ikki kishi bo'ldi" (considered, two people) in lieu of the blunt term "homilador" (pregnant). Additional

thematic categories pertain to the wish for dignity in discussing physical conditions and social status. Euphemistic language, for example, referring to physical disabilities and bodily functions, create framing to allow for respectful discussions about individuals and their condition, evident in English euphemisms like "physically challenged" and "visually impaired," Russian euphemisms such as "незрячий" (non-seeing) and "слабослышащий" (hard-of-hearing), and also for the Uzbek "ko'zi ojiz" (sight-impaired) and "qulog'i og'ir" (hard-of-hearing). Social relations and professions also bring about many euphemisms that elevate the job status of certain jobs like "sanitation engineer" in English, "сотрудник органов" (law enforcement officer) in Russian, and "kommunal xizmat ko'rsatish ishchisi" (municipal service worker) in Uzbek. Finally, the strategic environments of politics and economics use elaborate euphemisms that function to disguise the reality of a situation. For example, English euphemisms such as "collateral damage" for killing civilians, and "economic downturn" for a recession, Russian language uses euphemisms such as "вертикаль власти" (power vertical) and "оптимизация расходов" (budget cuts), and the euphemism "ijtimoiy himoya" (social protection) in incurred benefits in Uzbek, are all used to influence public opinion on a larger scale.

The structural-semantic classification of euphemisms alters the analytical lens from the content of the communication to the "how," which entails an examination of the linguistic mechanisms employed in creating a euphemistic expression. This perspective highlights the varied array of lexicon, grammatical structure, and beyond the lexicon or grammatical structure of the euphemism. As an example of the lexicon, metaphor is the obvious method here: metaphors make evocative parallels ("to fall asleep" for die, or in Uzbek "chiroqlar o'chdi" = the lights went out), metonymy allows one to refer indirectly to an act or phenomenon through a name related to a cause or associated concept (for example, "to use the bathroom" used for where that action occurs or "the crown" used for the monarchy), generalizability allows the euphemism to be more vague by using labels such as "it," "thing," and "situation" to replace more specific labels, abbreviation and borrowing allow opacity in referential term formation: for example, "WC" is a reference to bathroom in English, and "perspiration" is a borrowing from Latin for sweat, and the Russian "ЗК" (meaning ZK, "или зэк" meaning inmate) as a euphemism to refer to a prisoner. The use of euphemism in place of references serves as some of the most basis foundations for creating indirect references that are socially acceptable. In addition to mere word replacements, euphemisms are also derived from advanced grammatical and stylistic transformations. Grammatical mechanisms shift responsibility or soften direct statement in nuanced ways. In the classic political phrase, "Mistakes were made", the passive voice obscures the agent of an action. The conditional mood (e.g., "I would suggest...") is used as a form of politeness and hesitation, while negative forms (e.g., "not the smartest") alludes to a quality without calling it out. Stylistically, euphemism uses circumlocution or aphorisms, where a roundabout phrase can replace one brusque word, such as saying "living on borrowed time" instead of nearing death or "to let someone go" instead of being fired. Even irony can have a euphemistic function, even though it approaches dysphemism, using humor or sarcasm to create critical distance from a factual, uncomfortable thing, so it might be easier to talk about. This structural-semantic framework shows that euphemism is more than just a type of vocabulary, but a fluid process that is cemented within the grammatical and rhetorical context of a language.

Proposed Integrated Classification Model

Combining all the above aspects, the following multidimensional model is proposed. Each euphemism can be described within the framework of this model along 4 coordinates:

| Function | Theme | Structure | Degree (Conventionalization) |
|-----------------|-----------|----------------|---|
| Taboo Avoidance | Death | Metaphor | Stable ("passed away") |
| Politeness | Illness | Metonymy | Variable/Temporary (used in a specific period or group) |
| Concealment | Politics | Circumlocution | Archaic (fallen out of use) |
| Manipulation | Economics | Abbreviation | |

Example: The phrase "He passed away" can be described as follows:

Function: Taboo Avoidance (death).

Theme: Death.

Structure: Metaphor (journey metaphor).

Degree: Very stable, accepted in almost all contexts.

This model allows reflecting the complexity of euphemisms and also creates a systematic basis for comparing euphemisms in different languages and cultures.

DISCUSSION

This research highlighted that the study of euphemisms provides an essential framework for investigating the complex interrelation of language, culture, society, and human thought, much richer than thinking of this as simply word substitution. The suggested integrated classification model overcomes the shortcomings of earlier classifications by illuminating the multitude of facets which contribute to the phenomenon. One of the striking revelations is the functional variety of euphemisms; euphemisms do not exist to merely avoid taboo, but euphemisms perform a myriad of pragmatic functions including balancing the communicative act, maintaining social cohesion, sustaining self-interest, or relieving cognitive dissonance. Importantly, "concealment" and "manipulation" were identified as functionally core features of euphemism, highlighting a "dark side" of euphemism, illustrating how euphemisms can be powerful agents of power and control when situated in political and economic discourse, as well as a much more benign facet of politeness in culture. Finally, the study revealed the depth of cultural conditionality of euphemistic expression. The specific thematic areas which require softening are not uniform, but are a mirror reflection of the beliefs and values of the culture itself. For instance, while Western societies frequently euphemize topics like age and physical appearance, traditional societies, including Uzbek culture, place a greater emphasis on euphemisms that convey respect in family and social hierarchies, as seen in terms like "murod yoshida" (at the age of desire) used to respectfully reference old age. This aspect of cultural specificity is also demonstrated through the structural mechanisms used which, whilst sharing universal foundations and features, indicate cultural preferences. Euphemistic strategies such as metaphor, metonymy, and circumlocution can be considered universal "tools" for making euphemisms in all languages, however, their dominant structural features can still be culture specific. The preference for using proverbs, poetic forms, and religious vocabulary in euphemism making in Uzbek language, for example, is particularly prominent and connects to the language's greater history

signaling an artistic and spiritual tradition. To illustrate, "joningizga duo" (a prayer for your soul) is an illuminating example of a richer alternative to "rahmat" (thank you), and reinforces that the structural form of euphemisms often reflect culturally infused identity. Ultimately, what the integrated model confirms is that euphemisms are a complex rather than universal linguistic adaptive system. All human societies must use euphemisms to navigate communicating sensitive content, yet the functional factors of euphemism, topical emphasis and structural distinctions are all very much based in and reflective of the cultural, social, and cognitive environment they exist in.

The suggested integrative model for euphemism classification possesses substantial theoretical significance by addressing a number of lingering issues in the field. First, it tackles the vexatious issue of category boundary ambiguity by allowing the multi-axial analysis of a single expression. For example, the Uzbek expression "kadrlar o'zgarishi" (staff change) could belong to more than one category in a single expression, including: manipulative function, economic theme, generalization by semantic shift, and stable euphemism. This kind of three-dimensional perspective provides greater fidelity than isolating the contribution to a single category. Second, the model also includes an explicit "Degree" class to address the inherently dynamic lifespan of euphemisms – from emergence to mainstream use to obsolescence – thereby designating them as a living system that increases or decreases as values change over time. Finally, it structures an overall framework for cross-linguistic comparison by explicitly allowing a systematic way to evaluate euphemisms for a concept (i.e. death) across languages with respect to the consistent parameters: function, structure, and stasis. In this way, the category analysis allows other researchers to improve the rigor of comparative linguoculturology in a more structured, and perhaps deeper, way. The practical ramifications of this study and its models are far-reaching and profound. In terms of language teaching and learning, having a systematic access to euphemisms is key for a true level of communicative competence to support learners to address sensitive areas in interaction and speak with a degree of cultural appropriateness. For translators, and language professionals, the model provides a foundation to more accurately translate euphemisms, not only considering the denotative meaning, but more importantly, their pragmatic function and social weight in the target language. And in specialized fields such as medicine, law, and politics, organizations and individuals can benefit from the findings of this study to better manage relationships with patients, clients, and the public through the ability to understand and utilize euphemistic language and language in general. The model provides a necessary tool for cross-cultural communication in general, as it might prevent misunderstandings and social friction as a result of failing to manage culturally bound forms of language to discuss taboos. While there are limitations to this study (limited scope of linguistics and qualitative studies), future research should be focused on quantitative measures of the frequency of euphemisms, more experimental studies to consider their affect (e.g., public reception of "war" vs "special operation") with a more pronounced overall measure of impact using psychological measures, corpus linguistics to understand the more general evolution of euphemisms, and more thoughtful application of models and frameworks with more diverse languages such as from African, Asian, and Scandinavian cultures to test models for applications for broader and universal applicability.

CONCLUSION

To sum up, euphemistic expressions are not only simplistic "softeners" in language, but ingenious and sophisticated toolkits developed by humankind to wrestle with and articulate the most subtle, frightening, and multifarious realities of human life in the most acceptable form socially. The investigatory process involved in studying euphemisms goes well beyond the narrow confines of linguistics and begins to uncover the deeper layers of human consciousness, culture, and society. The integrated classification model proposed is designed to systematically study this complex phenomenon of euphemisms, unmasking both universal and specific properties of the phenomenon, while creating a more practical basis for and relationship to research in linguistics broadly.

REFERENCES:

1. Allan, K., & Burridge, K. (2006). *Forbidden Words: Taboo and the Censoring of Language*. Cambridge University Press.
2. Ayupova, R. A. (2010). *Lingvokulturologicheskie aspekty eufemizmov i disfemizmov*. [Linguocultural Aspects of Euphemisms and Dysphemisms]. Doctoral dissertation. Moscow.
3. Bolinger, D. (1980). *Language – The Loaded Weapon: The Use and Abuse of Language Today*. Longman.
4. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge University Press.
5. Crespo-Fernández, E. (2015). *Sex in Language: Euphemistic and Dysphemistic Metaphors in Internet Forums*. Bloomsbury Academic.
6. Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 3: Speech Acts* (pp. 41–58). Academic Press.
7. Holder, R. W. (2008). *A Dictionary of Euphemisms*. Oxford University Press.
8. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. University of Chicago Press.
9. Luchina, O. V. (2015). *Eufemizmy v politicheskom diskurse: kognitivno-pragmaticheskiy aspekt*. [Euphemisms in Political Discourse: Cognitive-Pragmatic Aspect]. Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta. Seriya 19. Lingvistika i mezhkulturnaya kommunikatsiya, (2), 45-54.
10. Neaman, J. S., & Silver, C. G. (1983). *Kind Words: A Thesaurus of Euphemisms*. Facts on File.
11. Nurmonov, A., et al. (2021). *Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tili*. [Modern Uzbek Literary Language]. O'zbekiston nashriyoti.
12. Qodirov, M. (2018). O'zbek tilida eufemizmlarning lingvomadaniy xususiyatlari. [Linguocultural Features of Euphemisms in the Uzbek Language]. *Filologiya masalalari*, (5), 112-117.
13. Rawson, H. (1981). *A Dictionary of Euphemisms and Other Doubletalk*. Crown Publishers.
14. Warren, B. (1992). *What Euphemisms Tell Us About the Interpretation of Words*. *Studia Linguistica*, 46(2), 128-172.
15. Zoll, A. (2018). *Euphemism and Dysphemism in the Digital Age*. *Language@Internet*, 16, article 2.