

Comparison of Taboos and Euphemisms of Russian, Uzbek and German Languages

Sakbaeva Muhabbat

Lecturer, Termez State University, Termez, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

An extensive literature is devoted to the issues of taboo and euphemism, in which the problems associated with these phenomena are considered in various aspects and on the basis of various languages. These studies are rooted in ancient theories of language and style and reflect the diversity of trends and methods existing in modern linguistics. The subject of synchronic and diachronic studies were the causes and types of tabooing, sociolinguistic and proper linguistic parameters of euphemisms, including their thematic, semantic and structural characteristics. The scope of the use of euphemisms, their functioning, the influence of their use on the semantic and stylistic changes taking place in the language were studied.

KEYWORDS: care, juxtaposition, contemporary, part

However, the authors of most studies, as if by default, take as a basis the far from indisputable idea that euphemism and the unit it replaces are semantically connected by synonymy relations, and practically do not consider the place of euphemisms in the system of nominative language means. The issues of the onomasiological status of euphemisms and those mechanisms that underlie their formation are clearly insufficiently studied. Answers to these questions can only be obtained on the basis of a detailed study of both semasiological and onomasiological relations between taboo words and euphemisms. An attempt to analyze these relationships made in this paper determines the relevance of the study.

An analysis of the semantic relations linking euphemisms and the units they replace showed that the spectrum of these relations is in fact much wider than the synonymy relations traditionally attributed to them.

In such a general form, this conclusion could be called predictable to a certain extent, since in the traditional definition of euphemisms as emotionally neutral words or expressions used instead of synonymous words or expressions that seem unacceptable to the speaker, the term "synonymous" is used clearly inaccurately. and, apparently, should be considered as a synonym for the term "coreferential", since the ability of two signs to correlate with one referent does not yet indicate their synonymy. However, only a detailed analysis of the linguistic material made it possible to determine the real place of synonymy in the general system of semantic relations between taboos and euphemisms, which turned out to be synonyms only in 32% of cases. Correlating with the same object or phenomenon, taboo and euphemism thus have a common referent. However, as analysis has shown, these two signs can name the referent so differently, the nomination can be based on such different signs that, while remaining coreferential, taboo and euphemism can have nothing in common either in

their denotative or in their significative meaning. . Undoubtedly synonymous in some cases, they may turn out to be semantically unrelated in others, which was recorded in 49% of cases. In the interval between these extreme cases, a wide variety of types of connections are found, depending not so much on the properties of the referent, but on the communicative and, if I may say so, nominative intentions of the speaker, and in some cases on his linguistic competence. An example of the latter is the use of broad-valued names instead of undesirable direct naming, including the place

The pointing gesture unambiguously relates the nominative unit to a certain object, even if it seems to the listener to be unmotivated, if he had never heard it before as the name of this referent. At the same time, such a unit undoubtedly evokes an association with a permanent, stable name of the same referent. As a result, a situation of heteronominativity arises, which allows the use of coreference to provide additional information about the subject. Such information can be logical, emotional, and evaluative. In this way, you can communicate something new about the subject itself, or you can communicate your attitude towards it or cause a certain attitude in the listener. That is why the relationship between unacceptable and acceptable ways of naming the same referent is only a special case of the situation of coreference. Euphemism is based on the principle of heteronominativity, and therefore coreference. However, this does not mean that all types of semantic relations that are possible between core-referential units in general are also possible in the case of taboos and euphemisms. As the analysis showed, there are practically no hypo-hyperonymic relations in this sphere, which is explained by the undesirability of naming the very sphere to which this or that referent belongs. The unacceptability of a hypernym implies the unacceptability of all hyponyms associated with it. An unacceptable hyponym, as a rule, means the unacceptability of naming and the general phenomenon of which it is a representative. Of course, here, as in almost any other linguistic phenomenon, exceptions are possible, but the validity of this conclusion is confirmed by the absence of taboos and euphemisms in hypo-hyperonymic relations in the studied material.

So, the conducted analysis showed that, contrary to the widespread idea, taboos and euphemisms are by no means always synonymous. This does not exclude the possibility of synonymous relations between them, and relations of both stylistic and ideographic synonymy. However, in addition to synonymous relations, they can also be characterized by antonymy relations, they can be related as broad-meaning units and units with specific semantics, they may not have any semantic connection at all, naming the same referent on the basis of its completely different and often unrelated characteristics. In the literature on onomasiology, it is widely believed that euphemisms are always secondary nominative units, both indirect and indirectly derived. However,

belonging to units of secondary nomination is not an obligatory characteristic of euphemisms: they can also be primary nominative units. Thus, the phenomenon of euphemism seems to be semantically much more complex than its traditional definition implies, and the mechanisms for creating euphemisms, which are based on the principle of heteronominativity, reflect all the richness of the nominative means of the language, which in this case are subordinate to the solution of a purely social, or rather, etiquette task. . The very variety of social motives for which a particular word at one stage or another may be considered unacceptable also requires a variety of euphemisms containing in some cases a more transparent, in others a less transparent allusion to something that is not subject to naming, euphemisms that allow or not allowing with their help to express the attitude towards what they veil. It is quite natural that in order to solve such diverse nominative tasks, appropriate linguistic means are required, which in this case is reflected in the variety of semantic relations between taboos and euphemisms.

Literature

- [1] Aleksandrov A. V. About the terms "taboos" and "euphemisms" / Phytology of the Earth, Vol. 8, Lviv State University. - Lvov, 1966. - S.25-32.
- [2] Altaev S. Euphemisms in the Turkmen language: Abstract of the thesis. dis. cand. philol. Sciences. Ashkhabad, 1955. - 17 p.
- [3] Andreeva V. K. Semantic relations of units in the lexico-semantic group//Studies in Romano-Germanic Linguistics, Vol. 5. Volgograd, 1975. - S. 3-20.
- [4] Apresyan Yu. D. Synonym problem//Problems of linguistics. 1957, - No. 6. - S. 84-88.
- [5] Apresyan Yu. D. Synonymy and synonyms//Problems of linguistics. 1969. -№4. -FROM. 75-91.
- [6] Apresyan Yu. D. Modern lexical semantics. II. Synonymous means of language and paraphrasing rules. //Russian language in the national school. 1972. - No. 3. - pp. 19-27

