



The Specificity of Euphemisms as Linguistic Units

Kabilova Sayyora Abdugarimovna

Termez State University, teacher of pedagogical institute

Abduvoxidova Dilnoza Boborahim qizi

Foreign language and literature, 102-group student

Abstract: This article summarizes the distortion of euphemism and provides information about the unity of euphemism in the works of Uzbek, Russian and English linguists. We should consider these symbols semantically and pragmatically.

Keywords: euphemism, language units, stereotypes, semantics, onomasiology, vocabulary.

Date of Submission: 20-02-2022

Date of Acceptance: 23-3-2022

Introduction: Since the use of euphemisms is one of the ways to communicate with the purpose, the communicative ability of the speaker is manifested. From this it can be concluded that the main symptoms of euphemism are:

As follows:

1. Inappropriate denotation sign;
2. Signs of semantic uncertainty Abbreviation of semantic functions.
3. official land reclamation sign.

When analyzing phenomena such as euphemisms, it is desirable that these approaches combine both, so that the contrast between onomasiological and semantic approaches within the semantic aspects of the study is clearly inappropriate. In practice, consider such euphemisms as:

It effectively delivers meaningful information to recipients, taking into account social, psychological, and normative social factors[3]. Practical ability is a feature of a communicative communicator. A sensible way to use words and phrases,

The ability to work with national cultural characters and stereotypes is what triggers a variety of emotional reactions (Karasik 2002 et al.). In a broad sense of pragmatism, pragmatic ability refers to the ability to make social interactions through language. Practical ability is reflected in linguistic considerations. Language reflection is interpreted as a type of linguistic behavior in the meaningful use of language. An analysis of its various facts, possibilities of use, and proportions. Evaluation and use of their work on the basis of criteria (Vepreva 2005; Vasilev 2003)[23].

Relevance of the topic: Many euphemisms refer to the generation of euphemisms: the essence of euphemisms is that they are an indirect denotation of something unwanted (Bushueva 2005; Katsev 1988; Senichkina 2006; Sheigal 2000, etc.).

The list of euphemistic nominations is provided mainly by the following unwanted researchers: A.M. Katsev, L.P. Krisin, V.P. E.P. Senichkina and others differ in detail and fit in many positions. Defining the subject area of euphemisms (mainly in English material), A.M. Katsev developed a lexical-semantic classification of euphemisms on the basis of a "conceptual aspect"[19]. According to his concept, there are ten groups of euphemisms: nominations are supernatural forces; names of death and illness; names of human defects (physical and mental); names related to the sexual sphere; names in the field of crimes and their consequences; names of poverty concepts; names of some professions; names of mental and physical disabilities;

names in the field of physiology; the names of some are L.P. According to Krisin, ephemeralism distinguishes two main thematic classes, in which euphemisms of the personal and social spheres are used in the consideration of "topics and directions of euphemisms" in Russian material. In the field of personal relationships: some physiological processes and situations are replaced. Parts of the body; male-female relationships;

names of illness and death. Abnormal expressions: diplomacy; repressive behavior of the authorities; state and military secrets;

military, intelligence, police and other activities, powers; distribution and service area. Relationships between Different national and social groups and their status. Several types of occupations (Krisin 1996, 389-390)[4].

According to E. P. Senichkina, "at different stages of social development, different groups of languages, euphemisms become relevant and irrelevant." (Senichkina 2006, 77).

Comparison of lists of euphemistic cryptography according to the classification of A. M. Katseva and L. P. Krisina L.P. For Chrisin, the "name of the supernatural power" is not included in it. However, modern euphemisms mean the protection of nature[7].

Thus, the academic "Grammar" corrects the euphemistic use of personal pronouns: "with pronouns it can replace any noun (...) words)"(Russian Grammar, Vol. 1, 1980, 533). In many cases, the concept of unacceptable denotation is associated with its negative evaluation. words with positive or neutral denotation (Vidlak 29 1967; Mankovskaya 1997; Wang Xingyi 2001; Pavlenko 1996).

For modern English speakers, the language of God's name evokes neutral or positive emotions. However, direct naming by native speakers is prohibited[12].

Ancient taboos treated God with fear, reverence, and humility. Given the nature of taboo, the euphemism for the meaningful name of God with the Supreme Court should be seen as an ancient euphemism, a linguistic monument of the past.L. A. Bulakhovsky argues that the taboo "encompasses not only fearful spirits, but also terrible and frightening things (e.g. gods)." By comparison, the Latin word vereri means: 1) "fear"; 2) "deep respect"; "Dear" (Bulakhovsky 1953, 50) In our opinion, the euphemistic expansion of the class of names is a verbal explanation of non-linguistic factors. leads to a verbal explanation of nolingustic factors[21].

For example, researchers refer to several forms of euphemisms ("you" instead of "you") (Mankovskaya 1997, 153). In our opinion, such an example should not be a euphemism, but an example of a means of expressing politeness [22]. V. I. Karasik analyzes the deixic vocative and cites an excerpt from a study by English scientists R. Brown and A.

Gilman. According to them, the antinomy "Sen-siz" (a symbol of friendship and decency) is a linguistic universality that can be interpreted in the song "power" and "solidarity". The emergence of pluralism leads to the use of the word "we" instead of "I" in the empire, and then to the judgment of "you". Historically, addressing "you" belonged only to the first person, and then the aristocratic representatives began to talk to each other and demanded such treatment [20]. In European culture

in the 12th and 13th centuries, "you" began to be used instead of "you": "you" usually refers to your master or a person equated to him [15].

E.P. According to Senichkina, the Russian language cannot be linked to euphemisms. When talking to an interviewee, if we want to express negative emotions, we have to remove the word 'you',

As noted, E.P. Senichkina, "The range of euphemisms in a language tends to be infinite in the elimination of the negative sign of a modified language [8]. On the same basis, euphemisms include diminutive references, for example, my friend, my sister" (Senichkina 2006, 19). Therefore, taking into account the negative sign of the substituted word does not allow referring to euphemisms. Language units that replace functional words represent a positive sign [10].

Fully accepting this view, we consider it expedient to consider the semantic criteria of a negative song from the point of view of linguistic considerations and from the point of view of practicality. When we use the mechanism of language, it is done through self-regulation of speech activity. This is of course the best option, as it is expressed in semantics and pragmatics [5].

NG Komlev is an example of how different types of displays are defined as real diversity. a) Specific objects (pen, bear, and mountains)

b) Abstract concepts (qualities, processes, (relationships),

The features of the object are as follows (Fast, flying)

ts) Language Categories (words, prepositions, verbs, prefixes)

d) Fantastic constructions - wonderful mythical creatures (mermaids, goblins, demons, house giants) [11].

It follows from this that the word as a material unit is a denotation, expressed in our mind in the form of a definite expression, a "psycholinguistic reality" (Gak 1990, 466). As a sufficiently clear sign, the word appears in a met linguistic description (e.g., in linguistic research) or in a linguistic reflection. However, with the set of denotative properties of a word, its met linguistic characterization differs significantly from the set of features related to word denotation in linguistic reflection [9].

In metallurgical (scientific) explanations, the class of abstract language signs characterized by word characteristics as extensions is the basic structural and semantic units of language (integral form, sound separation and local repetition, all their semantic and grammatical features, all objects with these features). Relatively called a "word." This, of course, does not preclude the possibility that a single word may be the subject of a scientific description, in which a single word acts as a denotative, whose features are reinforced in different types of linguistic analysis (semantic and morphological derivatives). In any case, the meaning of "encyclopedic" is preserved in the linguistic-met linguistic description [18].

From the point of view of the study of euphemisms, we are more interested in the interpretation of the word denoting by the speaker than in the metal linguistic description of the word denoting[6]. Linguistic reflection, the high level of abstraction of the word denoting leads to the need to consider it only in specific sculptures. z is called. The verbal features that make up this "simple" concept are significantly different from the features based on met linguistic descriptions.

Conclusion: This, in turn, leads to the fact that the word song, which is repeated with the symbols of the lyrics, is considered to be inseparable and a form. Let us now call it an almost essential, simple concept of special syncretism about the most meaningless word [14]. There is a simple notion of sonless words that is modified in this semi-essential and is based on the memory of the

words of the native speakers. Its phonetic and graphic design, grammatical features, connection with objects.

This word is related to the terms of use. If a word points to it, the result is evaluated Immoral words also begin to be evaluated negatively due to the syncretism of thought ("bad words").

THE REFERENCES:

1. Mikhaleva E. A. Language education as a component of the economic capital of the individual in the modern labor market / E. A. Mikhaleva // Fundamental research. - 2008. - № 7. - P. 91-93
2. Volosova M. V. Features of teaching English in schools in Japan / M. V. Volosova // Pedagogical magazine. 2015. - no. 1-2. - P. 10-20.
3. Kabilova Sayyora, & Aminova Zebo Hamrokulovna. (2021). OLD TRADITIONS OF AGRICULTURE OF SURKHAN VALLEY. *Emergent: Journal of Educational Discoveries and Lifelong Learning (EJEDL)*, 2(04), 43–49.
4. SAYYORA, K. Metaphor in Newspapers. *JournalNX*, 7(1), 210-214.
5. Salomova, G. A., & Khurramov, R. S. (2021). ABBREVIATION IN ENGLISH, UZBEK, RUSSIAN LANGUAGES DIFFERENT STRUCTURAL TYPES. *Web of Scientist: International Scientific Research Journal*, 2(12), 646-654.
6. Нарбашева М. А. РАЗВИТИЕ КОМПЕТЕНТНОСТИ У ПЕДАГОГА ДОШКОЛЬНЫХ ОБРАЗОВАТЕЛЬНЫХ ОРГАНИЗАЦИЙ //Наука и образование сегодня. – 2021. – №. 7 (66). – С. 65-66.
7. Нарбашева, М.А., 1993. *Психологический анализ развивающих функций народных игр (на материале игр дошкольников в камешки)* (Doctoral dissertation, автореф. дис.... канд. психол. наук).
8. Норбошева М. А. МАКТАБГАЧА ЁШДАГИ БОЛАЛАРНИНГ ОИЛА ҲАҚИДАГИ ТАСАВВУРЛАРИНИ ЎРГАНИШ //ИННОВАЦИИ В ПЕДАГОГИКЕ И ПСИХОЛОГИИ. – 2021. – Т. 4. – №. 6.
9. Норбошева М. А. ОИЛАДА МАЪНАВИЙ ТАРБИЯНИ ТАКОМИЛЛАШТИРИШДА МУМТОЗ АСАРЛАРНИНГ ЎРНИ //Педагогика ва психологияда инновациялар. – 2020. – Т. 8. – №. 3.
10. Норбошева М. А., Норбошева М. А. Реформы системы дошкольного образования в Узбекистане //Фундаментальные и прикладные исследования: гипотезы, проблемы, результаты. – 2018. – С. 25-29.
11. Норбошева М. О. МАКТАБГАЧА ЁШДАГИ БОЛА ШАХСИНИНГ РИВОЖЛАНИШИДА МУЛОҚОТНИНГ ЎРНИ //Педагогика ва психологияда инновациялар. – 2020. – Т. 9. – №. 3.
12. Норбошева М. О. РОЛЬ СЕМЬИ И ДОШКОЛЬНОЙ ОБРАЗОВАТЕЛЬНОЙ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ В ФОРМИРОВАНИИ ЛИЧНОСТИ РЕБЁНКА //Наука и образование сегодня. – 2021. – №. 7 (66). – С. 66-67.
13. Норбошева М.А. Шарқ алломаларининг таълим-тарбия масалари ҳақидаги қарашлари //Бухоронинг ислом цивилизациясидаги ўрни ва унга қўшган ҳиссаси - 2020 - 522-526б

14. Саломова, Г. А., & Хуррамов, Р. С. (2021). Структура, Семантика И Информационный Потенциал Аббревиатур. Таълим ва Ривожланиш Таҳлили онлайн илмий журнали, 1(6), 179-186.
15. Саломова, Г. А., Дустбоева, М., Кулниева, Ш., & Гулбаева, Г. (2018). НЕЛИЧНЫЕ ФОРМЫ АНГЛИЙСКОГО ГЛАГОЛА. *Интернаука*, (42-2), 8-10.
16. Саломова, Г. А., Жумаева, Н. А., & Хамроева, Д. (2020). ТЕОРЕТИЧЕСКИЕ ОСНОВЫ ОБУЧЕНИЯ ЛЕКСИКЕ АНГЛИЙСКОГО В СИСТЕМЕ ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ. In *Педагогика и психология в современном мире: теоретические и практические исследования* (pp. 63-67).
17. Саломова, Г. А., Маматмуродова, Т., Усарова, Н., & Чориева, Д. (2018). Педагогические науки. *НАУКА XXI ВЕКА*, 15.
18. Саломова, Г. А., Маматмуродова, Т., Усарова, Н., & Чориева, Д. Современные методы обучения английскому языку: игротехника как метод обучения английскому языку на начальном этапе.
19. Саломова, Г. А., Маматмуродова, Т., Усарова, Н., & Чориева, Д. Современные методы обучения английскому языку: игротехника как метод обучения английскому языку на начальном этапе.
20. Саломова, Г. А., Надирова, Х., Ашурова, Д., & Худойбердиева, С. (2019). ИНФОРМАЦИОННЫЕ ТЕХНОЛОГИИ НА УРОКАХ АНГЛИЙСКОГО ЯЗЫКА. In *МОЛОДОЙ ИССЛЕДОВАТЕЛЬ: ВЫЗОВЫ И ПЕРСПЕКТИВЫ* (pp. 29-34).
21. Саломова, Г. А., Файзиева, Ф. А., Рузикулова, М. О., & Паянова, М. К. (2019). ИСПОЛЬЗОВАНИЕ ИКТ И ИНТЕРНЕТ-РЕСУРСОВ НА УРОКЕ АНГЛИЙСКОГО ЯЗЫКА. In *МОЛОДОЙ ИССЛЕДОВАТЕЛЬ: ВЫЗОВЫ И ПЕРСПЕКТИВЫ* (pp. 36-40).
22. Саломова, Г., Абдуллаева, М., Хафизова, И., & Ахмедова, М. (2019). СОВРЕМЕННЫЕ ТЕХНОЛОГИИ ОБУЧЕНИЯ АНГЛИЙСКОМУ ЯЗЫКУ В СРЕДНЕЙ ШКОЛЕ. *Интернаука*, (7-1), 74-76.
23. Саломова, Г., Турсунов, Х., Бобоева, М., & Пайгамова, М. (2019). СЛОВООБРАЗОВАНИЯ В АНГЛИЙСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ. *Интернаука*, (44-1), 54-55.