



# CENTRAL ASIAN JOURNAL OF LITERATURE, PHILOSOPHY AND CULTURE

Volume: 03 Issue: 06 Jun 2022

## Dysphemism or Euphemism ?

*M. G. Rabiyeva*

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

*Received 19<sup>th</sup> Apr 2022, Accepted 15<sup>th</sup> May 2022, Online 8<sup>th</sup> Jun 2022*

### ANNOTATION

This article compares the specifics of dysphemism, its differences and similarities with euphemisms, and draws a line between them. In addition, the relationship of dysphemism with related concepts, aspects of commonalities are analyzed.

**KEYWORDS:** dysphemism, euphemism, vulgarism, taboo.

**Introduction.** Etymologically, the word "dysphemism" is derived from the negative dys- prefix (bad, abnormal, difficult) and from the Greek pheme (speech, voice, utterance, a speaking). The phenomenon of dysphemism was first recorded in 1927 by Albert Carnua, who described it as a mockery, a rude expression.

Two trends can be observed in any speech:

- a) euphemism;
- b) dysphemization.

In both cases, we witness a shift in personal or social relationships. In both society and in the linguistic activity of the individual, an increase in euphemism leads, at the same time, a decrease in dysphemisation, an increase in dysphemisation, a decrease in euphemism.

The use of dysphemism in the Western media and other sources of information has become more popular as a result of the recent acceleration of democracy, as well as the adoption of the Law on Freedom of Speech in the Declaration of Human Rights by the UN General Assembly on December 10, 1948. A deeper study, classification, interpretation and analysis of this linguistic phenomenon has once again placed the responsibility on the shoulders of linguists.

Although the phenomenon of dysphemism, which is considered to be the opposite of euphemisms, has existed since ancient times, it is significantly less studied than euphemisms. Initially, the same phenomenon, which attracted the attention of European linguists, was reflected in the works of such scientists as Vidlak, Jelvis, Katsev, Sheygal, Allan, Giezek. They argue that the similarity of dysphemisms with euphemisms is that they impose a certain connotative content on the denotation, form a synonymous line at the level of language, are considered as an ancient process and a speech phenomenon, as well as euphemisms.

Dysphemism is briefly explained in OS Akhmanova's dictionary "Dictionary of linguistic terms", A. Shomaksudov's book "Stylistics of the Uzbek language". In turn, MM Mirtojiev in the monograph "Semasiology of the Uzbek language" extensively analyzed the existing views and conclusions about dysphemism and pointed out the subtleties between them. In particular, AN Rezanova studies the dysphemisms of the English language and emphasizes that it is an ancient process. The work deals with the history of dysphemism, the etymology of expressions with negative connotations, the functions of artistic and colloquial speech, the classification and analysis of lexical-semantic dysphemisms, and the fact that "dysphemism is a negative assessment of denotation. negative) is a linguistic expression. Also, TV Boyko, TS Bushuyeva study dysphemism side by side with euphemism.

Although the phenomenon of dysphemism has existed for a long time, it is sufficiently established at the level of speech as a result of various vices (drug addiction, prostitution, theft, orphanhood) that escalated after the Second World War, and over time linguistics has become a source of research. turns.

According to research on the definition and delineation of euphemisms and dysphemisms, not all stylistically negative language units can be classified as dysphemias, although in some cases discriminatory, insulting, taboo, vulgar lexicon is a conceptual-semantic can serve as a source.

Given that a particular phrase belongs to a class of euphemisms or dysphemisms, it can be determined not only by a number of social relations that are different for different dialect groups, but also by customs, and that euphemisms and dysphemisms have no universals. Thus, in defining euphemisms and dysphemisms, diachronic changes in the semantics of a language unit, context, and the speaker's personal approach to perceiving something or an event must be taken into account.

### **Approaches to the study of euphemism and dysphemism**

The study of euphemism and dysphemism in modern linguistics is based on three approaches:

1. functional-semantic [Sheigal 2000; Rezanova 2008];
2. functional-pragmatic (within the dialectic of nominative variability) [Allan, Burridge 2006: 29];
3. diachronic [Kröll 1984: 12].

According to the functional-semantic approach, the (first approach) dysphemism is defined as invective as opposed to euphemism and based on hyperbolization of a negative trait or replacement of a positive evaluation sign with a negative [Sheigal 2000: 236]. Here, euphemism means "a softer expression that can be used instead of a rude or obscene word" [Zhrebilo 2010: 462]. Dysphemism, as opposed to euphemism, is "a means of substituting a more rude, obscene word for the expression of reality or a particular object; unity of language and speech as opposed to euphemism "[Zhrebilo 2010: 96]. In other words, within the framework of this approach to dysphemisms, it is considered connotatively and semantically the opposite of euphemism.

In our opinion, the functional-semantic approach has led to a number of conflicts of opinion due to the fact that one or another expression is included in the class of absolute dysphemisms or euphemisms, without taking into account cognitive-pragmatic factors (context / discourse). It is well known that in assessing the expression of language, first of all, the purpose of the speaker and sociolinguistic factors must be taken into account.

According to the second approach, only in the context does dysphemism reveal a negative aspect of meaning that is pragmatic and dangerous to the culture of communication. K. Allan and K. Burridge consider the

phenomena of euphemism and dysphemism in the dialectic of nominative variation and suggest the use of the term hyperonym x-femism, which generalizes these phenomena [Allan, Burridge 2006: 29]. Nominative variation within this approach implies the emergence of new meanings of words in a particular context. Thus, by the term x-feminism, we mean a metacommunicative phenomenon of a nonlinear and variable nature.

In this approach, the cognitive-pragmatic factor is considered as one of the main factors of euphemism and dysphemism. It covers the context and the purpose of the speaker. The speaker decides to use a euphemistic or dysphemistic expression in his speech, depending on the purpose. It is clear that the speaker is consciously using this or that expression to achieve the intended purpose of communication. Thus, the criteria for determining euphemism and dysphemism should be based primarily on the cognitive-pragmatic attitude and situation of the speaker, so that the speech situation occurs.

The diachronic semantic approach to the study of euphemism and dysphemism suggests that "an expression that is considered euphemism today may most likely become dysphemism tomorrow, or vice versa" [Kröll 1984: 12] (cit. po: [Duda 2011: 9]). In other words, before a particular expression can be included in the category of euphemisms or dysphemism, it must be studied in terms of its semantic evolution. For example, the word *gay* appears in the Oxford English Dictionary in the 14th century and means (light-hearted) - "cheerful, carefree". Later, in the seventeenth century, the word took on a new meaning - "a person who leads a free and immoral life." In time, this euphemism turned into sexual dysphemism. It was not until the nineteenth century that it began to be used to describe a "woman who lived an immoral life, a prostitute." The word "gay" was considered obscene and insulting until 1970, when the dysphemistic nature of the word was neutralized "[Duda 2011: 10].

In our view, functional-pragmatic and diachronic approaches are the most effective in the study of both phenomena, as they focus on the role of diachronic and contextual changes in language as a complex dynamic system.

### **Dysphemism and related phenomena**

The uncertainty and diversity of the nature of the phenomenon of dysphemism has led many researchers to consider any expression with a stylistically negative sema as dysphemism. In this chapter, we will try to draw a clear line between euphemisms, dysphemism, and related events. In our view, ridiculous and insulting vocabulary can serve as a conceptual-semantic source of dysphemism, but not always.

In other words, the process of dysphemization is based not on a negative, but on a person's neutral cognitive experience, which is then perceived by members of society as a negative connotation as a result of linguistic influence (euphemistic substitution) and is firmly established in language.

Expressions that have a discriminatory or negative connotation can include words that are socially forbidden and unethical. Thus, in the semantics of such lexemes, the connotative meaning of the insulting word is clearly expressed (for example, the insulting word *lecher- wife*). Hence, insulting words that express flaws in human nature (e.g., *hypocrite- two-faced*) are primarily related to the linguistic perception of a person's negative and disgusting aspects. In such cases, there is no need to soften the expression (use of euphemisms), because such insulting words can not be considered dysphemism. On the contrary, the referent of the invalids is perceived by the members of the society not only as negative, but also as an expression with a discriminatory connotation. The word *invalids* became dysphemism when its relatively gentle and gentle equivalents in language appeared *challenged / differently abled people*.

Some researchers often associate taboo vocabulary with dysphemism. We believe that taboo can be a conceptual source of dysphemism, but not in all cases. The tabloid lexicon, unlike the insulting dictionary, describes unpleasant and closed realities that exist in different parts of society, where the realities do not necessarily have to be associated with a negative experience. In turn, insulting vocabulary draws attention to the psychological negative aspects of reality. Accordingly, there is a relative need to use euphemistic units among members of the community. Therefore, in such cases, it is appropriate to consider taboo as a conceptual source of dysphemism.

<i>sex worker</i>	<i>prostitute</i>	<i>whore</i>
Euphemism	Pejorative dysphemism	Dysphemism-taboo

Vulgarism is also a discursive powerful tool for certain social groups, such as taboos, in particular, the general population, the uncultured or the poor [Jay 1992: 6]. According to Mercury, vulgarisms are the language of the street, of ordinary people. Bright, but far from any moral norms, "dirty" and obscene imagery is a feature that distinguishes vulgarism from other related phenomena.

Since taboo and insulting lexicon are related to the object of human cognitive activity, then vulgarisms describe the subject's ability to perceive, his social status, and possibly his level of intellectual development.

In our view, vulgarisms can in some cases serve as a lexical-semantic source of dysphemism because they encode connotative semantics (evaluation, rudeness) as taboos. At the same time, the use of vulgar vocabulary is directly related to a two-pronged pragmatic process: the speaker not only ignores the norms of morality accepted in society, but also shows how low his culture and intellect are.

<i>urinate</i>	<i>pee</i>	<i>piss</i>
Euphemism (special term)	Euphemism (informal)	dysphemism (vulgarism)

**Conclusion.** Thus, although euphemisms and dysphemisms are essentially the same in nature, they have opposite expressions in terms of positive and negative. Euphemism by using smooth, pleasant, civilized words instead of taboo, rude, indecent words; dysphemism occurs through the use of harsh, vulgar, indecent words about a person, thing, action, situation, and so on. Both are expressed as derivative meanings of the word. While euphemism is a changing layer, that is, a layer that quickly replaces old with new, dysphemism is not unique. They are also objective phenomena in language.

#### References:

1. Kasimova, N. F. (2017). Communicative functions of the interrogative sentences in English. In *Приоритетные направления развития науки* (pp. 59-62).
2. Zokirova Nargiza Savriyevna. (2021). Interpretation of Concepts of Human Dignity by Heroes in Utkir Khoshimov's Works. *Middle European Scientific Bulletin*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.47494/mesb.2021.11.468>
3. Khaydarova, L. (2022). MAIN APPROACHES TO COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING. MODELS AND METHODS FOR INCREASING THE EFFICIENCY OF INNOVATIVE RESEARCH, 11(1), 257-261.
4. Ilhomovna, M. M. (2020). JOHN STEINBEK's "THE WINTER OF OUR DISCONTENT": INTERPRETATION OF THE CHARACTER AND THE IMAGE OF THE WRITER. *European Scholar Journal*, 1(4), 18-20.

5. Bakhtiyorovna, I. F. . (2021). Translation of linguocultural peculiarities in hafiza kochkarova's translations. *Middle European Scientific Bulletin*, 12, 247-249.
6. Haydarova Nodirabegim Ahtamjon qizi. (2022). Interdiscursivity and Intertextuality: Relation of Concepts. *Eurasian Research Bulletin*, 7, 180–184. Retrieved from <https://geniusjournals.org/index.php/erb/article/view/1295>
7. Imamkulova, S., 2021. The Intensity of Word Meanings. *EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF INNOVATION IN NONFORMAL EDUCATION*, 1(2), pp.227-229.
8. Anvarovna, F. A. (2022, April). PECULIARITIES TRANSLATION OF CONCEPTUAL METAPHORS USED IN SELF-HELP DISCOURSE. In *E Conference Zone* (pp. 58-60).
9. Salixova, N. N. (2019). PECULIAR FEATURES OF TEACHING READING. *Theoretical & Applied Science*, (11), 705-708.
10. Ruziyeva Nilufar Xafizovna, & Xolova Madina Boboqulovna. (2022). Politeness In Literary Works: An Overview. *Eurasian Research Bulletin*, 7, 200–206.
11. Olimova Dilfuza Zokirovna. (2022). The specifics of translation actions in simultaneous interpreting. *Middle European Scientific Bulletin*, 22, 292-295.
12. Рабиева, М. (2021). ФУНКЦИОНАЛЬНЫЙ АСПЕКТ ЭВФЕМИЗМА В СОВРЕМЕННЫХ АНГЛИЙСКИХ СМИ. *ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.Uz)*, 7(7).
13. 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.
14. Narzullayeva, F. (2021). ВЫРАЖЕНИЕ СЛОВА «ГОЛОВА» В АНГЛИЙСКИХ И УЗБЕКСКИХ ФРАЗАХ. *ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.Uz)*, 3(3).
15. Babayev, M. (2021). ИЗУЧЕНИЕ ЛОШАДЕЙ С НЕМЕЦКИМ СУФФИКСОМ В ПРОЦЕССЕ ОБУЧЕНИЯ. *ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.Uz)*, 6(6). извлечено от [http://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals\\_buxdu/article/view/3576](http://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals_buxdu/article/view/3576)
16. Ramazonovna T. S. On binary structured speech products in french // *Asian Journal of Multidimensional Research*. – 2021. – Т. 10. – №. 10. – С. 381-386.
17. Mehmonova, Y. C. (2022). LEXICO-GRAMMATICAL RESOURCES OF FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENCE IN THE TRANSLATION OF TEXTS FROM ENGLISH INTO UZBEK. *Eurasian Journal of Academic Research*, 2(2), 349-353.
18. Fattohovich, D. F., & Ilhomovna, R. S. (2022). Innovative technologies as a means of teaching foreign languages. *Integration of Pragmalinguistics, Functional Translation Studies and Language Teaching Processes*, 237-240.
19. 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.
20. Abdikarimovich, B. O. (2021). The views of Jalaliddin Rumi. *Middle European Scientific Bulletin*, 12, 319-322.
21. Sobirovich, S. R. (2021). Ethymological Doublets Between French Verbs And Their Use. *Middle European Scientific Bulletin*, 13.