

Difficulties of Differentiating Euphemisms and Dysphemisms

M.G. Rabiyeva

Bukhara State University, The department of Translation Studies and Language Education

Annotation: The article discusses the existing approaches to the study of the phenomena of euphemism and dysphemism. It was revealed that the methodology of the study of euphemism and dysphemism should rely mainly on the principle of holism, which means the synthesis of data personal sciences, providing a holistic and interdisciplinary study of the language as cognitive-communicative, sociocultural and biopsychological phenomenon. Functional-Pragmatic and Diachronic Approaches to the Study of Euphemisms and dysphemisms stand out as the most effective.

In order to identify criteria identification of euphemism and dysphemism in the framework of this study in detail the phenomenon of dysphemism and related phenomena are considered. It was found that to dysphemisms cannot be attributed to all stylistically reduced vocabulary, although in some in some cases, pejorative, taboo, vulgar vocabulary can be conceptual-semantic source of dysphemism.

Key words: euphemism, dysphemism, orthophemism, diachronic semantics, context.

X-phemism- the union set of euphemism, orthophemism and dysphemism) is primarily determined from evaluating expressions within the particular context in which they are uttered. Given there is such complexity and variety of opinions and attitudes, we are unlikely to ever find uniformity of judgement between speakers of even very similar social backgrounds. There is never ‘Everyman’s euphemism’ or ‘Everyman’s dysphemism’. However, it would ignore reality to pretend that ordinary people do not perceive expressions to be somehow intrinsically X-phemistic: terms for ‘die’ such as *pass away* and *sleep* are euphemistic, whereas *croak* and *peg out* are not. Milwood-Hargrave [2000] is a British survey where participants were asked to respond to the perceived ‘strength’ of twenty-eight swearwords. No context was provided; yet, participants were clear about the severity of these words and the researchers were able to put together a broad topography of swearwords across all groups. Modern dictionaries also treat expressions as if they were inherently dysphemistic when they indicate offensive connotations of particular entries. The *Encarta World English Dictionary* recognizes three degrees of offensiveness: ‘insulting’, ‘offensive’, and ‘taboo’. Similarly,

those who compile dictionaries of euphemisms and dysphemisms, such as Ayto (1993) and Green (1996), base their collections on the prejudiced social attitudes to the situation in which they believe a given expression is uttered. This sort of ‘sensitive handling’ employs a type of good etiquette gauge by which is determined the X-phemistic value of an expression without reference to the context of use (cf. the ‘middle class politeness criterion’ in Allan and Burridge [2006: 33]). Like Allan (this volume), this is also the measure I will be assuming here where context is not specified.

Euphemism. We know that human speech activity is largely based on ethical norms. The use of other words and phrases instead of words that are morally or culturally forbidden or considered inconvenient is called euphemisms (Greek “euphemo” - meaning “I speak well, softly”). Most of us use similar words every day. The term “euphemism” in English was first coined in 1656 by T.W. Mentioned by Blaunt in Glossography and describing the phenomenon of euphemism as “a good or favourable interpretation of a bad word”. The use of euphemisms in speech stems from a desire to communicate successfully.

From the point of view of functional semantics dysphemism is defined is divided as the opposite of a euphemism and as an invective based on hy-perbolization of a negative attribute or replacement of a positive evaluative sign to negative [Sheigal 2000: 236]. A typical example of such “associations” is also the article “Euphemism” from the “Dictionary of Linguistic terms” edited by T. V. Zhrebilo.

A euphemism here means “a milder expression instead of a rude or obscene one” [Zhrebilo 2010: 462]. Euphemism is opposed to dysphemism - replacing “the designation of an object, a phenomenon with a more vulgar, rude, familiar word; unit of language and speech, the opposite of euphemism” [Zhrebilo 2010: 96].

According to the Oxford English Dictionary, **dysphemism** is defined as an offensive and “unpleasant” term used in place of “pleasant” or neutral; opposite of euphemism. Dysphemism is a contextually conditioned meaning generation of negative appraisal, pragmatically dangerous for the culture of speech interaction. K. Allan and K. Burridge consider the phenomena of euphemism and dysphemism in the dialectic of nominative variation and suggest using the hypernym term x-phemism, which generalizes these phenomena [Allan, Burridge 2006: 29].

Euphemism and dysphemism are two cognitive processes of conceptualisation, with countervailing effects (having the same base and resources but different aims and purposes), of a certain forbidden reality. The expressiveness immanent in these phenomena is so consubstantial that it explains not only its forbidden origin (the affective ambivalence of the taboo or the paradoxical description of its intrinsic essence), but also that sometimes the forbidden term does not exist, with

the use of euphemistic/dysphemistic expressions that, given their connotative contents, go beyond what the corresponding forbidden terms would designate. It is precisely this expressive capacity of euphemistic and dysphemistic nature that shows that the dividing line between taboo and dysphemism is, on occasions, quite blurred, so that a taboo term is not readily available, and that the boundary between euphemism and dysphemism is not entirely clear. These conflicting emotions and antagonistic feelings facilitate the existence of dysphemistic euphemisms and euphemistic dysphemisms.

So, within the framework of this approach, the main factors of euphemism and dysphemism are cognitive-pragmatic factors, which are primarily the context of the utterance is worn (the empirical environment of relative, but never absolute interactions) and the intention of the speaker. It should be noted that the concept of “context” includes both the current context and the “initial context” the text of communication, i.e. the state of affairs, which later, when making a speech act inevitably changes” [Dyck 1989: 21]. The original context is referred to as “events and actions that occurred immediately before the speech act, so and information accumulated in relation to "earlier" states" [There same]. The intention of the speaker lies in the idea that he puts into some euphemistic or dysphemistic expression and, accordingly, but, for the purposes that he pursues when using euphemism and dysphemism.

Dysphemisms and related phenomena have led many researchers to classify any stylistically reduced vocabulary as dysphemisms. In the framework of this study, in order to identify criteria for identifying euphemism and dysphemism, we will try to draw a line between dysphemisms and related phenomena, along with this, considering cases where dysphemisms can be identical to the latter.

In this regard, we believe that pejoratives denoting negative personality traits (e.g. hypocrite) are associated with linguistic cognition inherently negative, emotionally repulsive aspects of the personality. In view of The fact that in such cases a euphemistic substitution is not required, such pejoratives cannot be considered dysphemisms. On the contrary, the noun invalids as the reference not so much to the negatively perceived as to the socially vulnerable category of people, “thanks to” the established norms of more polite designation of challenged/differently abled people, acquired a pejorative character and became dysphemism.

Thus, ethnic pejoratives, in our opinion, can be considered dysphemisms only if they initially exclude semes of negation, fixing the connotatively negative experience of ethnocultural knowledge, i.e. their evaluativeness is not semantically, but socially conditioned by the communicatively negative reaction of the nominated ethnic group, where more neutral equivalent (e.g. Eskimo - Inuit). At the same time, such an equivalent is conventionally assigned to the linguistic society of a given ethnic

group, and its intentional replacement on dysphemism (as a rule, not a representative of this ethnic group) is pragmatically mediated by the strategy of enmity.

Some researchers often attribute taboo vocabulary to pejorative vocabulary, identifying it with dysphemisms. We believe that taboo may be a conceptual source of dysphemia, but not in all cases. Taboo vocabulary differs from pejorative vocabulary in that it characterizes cognition not psychologically negative aspects of reality, but, as it were, closed to knowledge, undesirable, but objectively existing areas life, not necessarily associated with negative experiences. Due to the fact that no one has canceled such realities and concepts, the linguistic society inevitably has a need for their euphemistic objectification, therefore, in such cases, it is taboo considered as a conceptual source of dysphemia. For example.:

- sex worker: euphemism;
- prostitute: dysphemism-pejorative;
- whore: dysphemism-taboo.
- urinate: euphemism (specialized vocabulary);
- pee: euphemism (informal style);
- piss: dysphemism (vulgarism).

Vulgarisms, like taboos, are a powerful means of discursive markedness of certain social groups, in particular, poorly educated, less cultured or “undersocialized” segments of the population [Jay 1992: 6]. This is so-called. the language of the street, the common people, whose distinguishing feature is the bright, but "dirty" and frivolous imagery, devoid of aesthetics [Mercury 1995].

Conclusion. Thus, as a result of the study, it was revealed that x-phemia is a non-linear fluctuation metacommunicative phenomenon, and diachronic changes (semantic changes in a language unit over time) should serve as criteria for identifying euphemism and dysphemia time), the current context/discourse within which this or that another expression, the original context, the speaker's personal perception of the object, or phenomena (subject-object relationship).

References:

1. Шейгал 2000 — Шейгал Е. И. *Семиотика политического дискурса*. Дис. ... д-ра филол. наук. Волго-градский государственный педагогический университет. Волгоград, 2000. 431 с.
2. Жеребило 2010 — Жеребило Т. В. *Словарь лингвистических терминов*. 5-е изд. Назрань: Пилигрим, 2010. 486 с.

3. Allan, Burridge 2006 — Allan K., Burridge K. *Forbidden words: taboo and the censoring of language*. Cambridge:Cambridge University Press, 2006. 303 p.
4. Rabiyeva, M. . (2022). THE PROBLEM OF EQUIVALENCE OF EUPHEMISMS. Eurasian Journal of Academic Research, 2(2), 354–358.
5. Рабиева, М. (2021). Дихотомия эвфемизма и фразеологизма: Дихотомия эвфемизма и фразеологизма. ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.Uz), 7(7).
6. Nafisa Farkhadovna Kasimova, & Masuma Umarovna Sharipova. (2022). Uzbek and English Philosophy and Phraseology About Happiness as a Value. Eurasian Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 7, 47–49.
7. Zokirova Nargiza Savrievna. (2022). The Concept of Discourse as A Cognitive Phenomenon of Translation. Eurasian Research Bulletin, 7, 207–211.
8. Khaydarova L., Joanna I. Dark Tourism: Understanding the concept and the demand of new experiences //ASIA PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MARKETING & MANAGEMENT REVIEW ISSN: 2319-2836 Impact Factor: 7.603. – 2022. – Т. 11. – №. 01. – С. 59-63.
9. Haydarova Nodirabegim Ahtamjon qizi. (2022). INTERTEXTUALITY VS INTERDISCURSIVITY AS AN ESSENTIAL PHENOMENON OF MODERN DISCOURSE. *E Conference Zone*, 53–55. Retrieved from <https://econferencezone.org/index.php/ecz/article/view/422>
10. MUXTOROVA, M. (2022). OZBEK SHE'RIYATINING INGLIZCHA OGIRMALARIDA VATANPARVARLIK GOYASI IFODASIDA SOZ TANLASH MUAMMOSI. ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.Uz), 8(8).
11. Irgasheva Feruza Bakhtiyorovna. (2021). INTEGRATION OF LANGUAGE AND CULTURE INTO THE TRANSLATION PROCESS . CENTRAL ASIAN JOURNAL OF LITERATURE, PHILOSOPHY AND CULTURE, 2(1), 32-34.
12. Imamkulova, S. I. (2022). INTENSITY OF WORD MEANINGS AND LINGUA-CULTUROLOGY. Eurasian Journal of Academic Research, 2(2), 344-348.
13. Anvarovna, A. F. (2021). Peculiarities of translating self-help book titles into the uzbek language. ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal, 11(11), 869-873.
14. N. N. Salikhova. (2022). Comparative Analysis of Interjections in the Contexts of Uzbek and English Languages. Eurasian Research Bulletin, 7, 189–191.

15. Ruzieva, N. (2022). НЕГАТИВНЫЕ СТРАТЕГИИ ВЕЖЛИВОСТИ НА АНГЛИЙСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ. ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.Uz), 8(8).
извлечено от https://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals_buxdu/article/view/5833
16. Olimova, D. Z. (2021). Transfer of modality in translation (modal verbs and their equivalents, modal words). Middle European Scientific Bulletin, 12, 220-22.
17. To'rayeva Fazilat Sharafiddinov. (2022). Analysis Of Modal Words and Particles in German and Uzbek Languages. Eurasian Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 3, 151–154.
18. Narzullayeva, F. (2022). Konnotativ ma'noning nutqda voqelanishi. ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.Uz), 8(8).
19. Tashpulatovich, B. M. . (2021). Using Multimedia Technologies in Teaching Foreign Languages. Middle European Scientific Bulletin, 12, 64-67.
20. Tuyboeva , S. . . (2022). LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF SIMPLE SENTENCE CONSTRUCTION IN UZBEK AND FRENCH . Eurasian Journal of Academic Research, 2(3), 184–187.
21. Yulduz, M. (2021). Lexico-grammatical Parts of Speech Expressing the Indefiniteness of the Subject. *JournalNX*, 7(1), 323-327.
22. Djalolov Furqat Fattohovich. (2021). Causes of Low Assimilation of Knowledge at General Secondary Schools. Middle European Scientific Bulletin, 11.
23. Otabekovna, S. M., & Ibragimovna, G. M. (2022). Expression of ethnic and cultural identity in english and uzbek proverbs. *ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 12(1), 171-175.
24. Abdikarimovich, M. B. O. (2020). The True Values of the Mavlono Jaloliddin Muhammad Rumi's Philosophy in Russian Translations. *International Journal on Orange Technologies*, 2(12), 68-71.
25. Shakirov, R. (2021). ЭТИМОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ ДУБЛЕТЫ В СИСТЕМЕ ФРАНЧУЗСКИХ ГЛАГОЛОВ И ИХ ИСПОЛЬЗОВАНИЕ. ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.Uz), 1(1).
извлечено от https://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals_buxdu/article/view/2344