ABSTRACT:
Euphemia is a complex universal communicative phenomenon, in its structure being a diverse linguistic phenomenon that plays an important role in the history of the development of society. Euphemisms are "a reflection of moral and spiritual culture, value attitudes, peculiarities of thinking and worldview of an individual and an ethnocultural community
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INTRODUCTION:
Euphemisms are traditionally defined as "emotionally neutral words or expressions used instead of synonymous words or expressions that seem indecent, rude or tactless to the speaker" (Arapova, 1990: 590), as well as "occasional individual-contextual substitutions of some words with others in order to distort or masking the true essence of what is designated" (Arapova, 1990: 590).

Euphemia is a universal, multidimensional phenomenon with its own cultural, social, historical, psychological and linguistic specificity, the study and analysis of which are the main tasks of this work.

In the linguistic bibliography, there are many definitions of euphemisms that reflect certain functions of the phenomenon. Some definitions give a broader description of a given linguistic phenomenon, while others, on the contrary, and are narrower. As a result of the analysis, it is possible to conditionally subdivide the studied definitions into three groups, according to the functions of euphemisms reflected in them, which contributes to a deeper understanding of the essence of this phenomenon. The definitions of the first group are characterized by the understanding of the softening of the rough and the unpleasant meaning as the only function of the euphemism. This group includes definitions:

— O.S. Akhmanova: "a path consisting in an indirect, covered, polite, relaxed designation of any object" (Akhmanova, 2007: 521);
— I.R. Halperin: "a word and phrases that appear in the language to designate concepts that already have names, but are considered for some reason unpleasant, rude, indecent or low" (Halperin, 1958: 164);
— C. Kaney: "the way in which an unpleasant, offensive or fearsome word is replaced by an indirect or milder term" (Kaney, 1960: 5);
— L.L. Nelyubin: "a word or expression serving under certain conditions to replace those designations that seem undesirable to the speaker, not quite polite or too harsh" (Nelyubin, 2003: 253);
— D.E. Rosenthal: "a softening designation of an object or phenomenon, a softer expression instead of a rude one" (Rosenthal, Telenkova, 1985).

The definitions of the second group also unite attention to the social motives of the use of euphemisms, these include the definitions:

An analysis of all the above definitions allows us to draw conclusions about the main functions of euphemisms. Here is given some of them:
1. Mitigation of the rude and unpleasant for the speaker, which involves the speaker's
assessment of the subject of speech as such, the
direct designation of which is perceived by him
as indecency, harshness or rudeness.

2. Mitigation of the rude and unpleasant for the
interlocutor, which implies the dependence of
the use of euphemism on the conditions of
speech and context, as well as the social
conditioning of ideas about what can act as a
euphemism.

3. Disguise of reality, which presupposes the
selection by the speaker of designations, not
only softening certain unacceptable words or
expressions, but also veiling, disguising the
essence of the phenomenon.

As a result, the definition of a
euphemism capable of fully reflecting the
essence of this phenomenon must take into
account all its functions. Euphemism is the
replacement of any undesirable (rude or
unlawful) word or expression with a more
correct one, the purpose of which is to avoid
directly naming what can cause negative
feelings in communication participants, as well
as to mask certain facts of reality. Euphemia is
not quite clearly separated from other related
linguistic phenomena, and the very concept of
euphemism remains somewhat vague, covering
numerous functions that are also inherent in
other linguistic phenomena. In this regard, a
large number of difficulties arise in
determining the boundaries of the
phenomenon of euphemia.

N.M. Potapova considers euphemisms as
a protective psychological mechanism
(Potapova, 2008: 138), highlighting the
following features: — Semantic uncertainty; —
Negative evaluativeness, aesthetic or stylistic
coloration of the denotation, requiring
improvement; — The ability to create positive
or neutral connotations due to its use while
maintaining the truth of the statement.

E.P. Senichkina identifies the main
(universal, characteristic of all euphemistic
substitutions) and essential (characteristic of
most euphemisms) signs of euphemisms. All
euphemisms have the following main features
(Senichkina, 2008: 6):
— Designation of an unwanted denotation (the
denotation of a euphemism refers to an object
or phenomenon characterized by a negative
assessment or negative connotation);
— Semantic ambiguity of the euphemism
(allowing to mitigate the negative assessment
of the denotation);
— Improvement of the character of the
denotation (in comparison with the replaced
expression or word) - "in order to become a
euphemism, a new name must create
associations in the minds of the speaker and
listener with an object or phenomenon of a
more positive assessment than the denotatum"
(Katsev, 1989: 5);
— The formal nature of improving the
denotation (the addressee can understand
what the speaker is talking about).

Euphemism is not only a trope
consisting in the implicit expression of a
negative assessment, but also an element of the
structure of the language that plays an
important role in its historical development,
since euphemization is a continuous process of
changing the names of various objects and
phenomena, as well as replacing some names
with others based on a constant evaluation and
re-evaluation by a person of forms of
expression, proceeding from the desire to build
communication in the most successful way.
Speaking about the importance of taking into
account the socio-cultural background against
which the need to use euphemisms arises, L.P.
Krysin highlights the following essential points
in the euphemization process (Krysin, 1994:
28-49):

The speaker's assessment of the subject
of speech as such, the direct designation of
which can be qualified in a given social
environment or by a specific addressee as
rudeness, harshness, indecency, etc. (this
applies to certain objects, objects, realities, spheres of human activity and relations);

Selection by the speaker of such designations that not only soften certain seemingly rude words and expressions, but mask, veil the essence of the phenomenon (cf.: neoplasm instead of tumor, pediculosis instead of lice);

The dependence of the use of euphemism on the context and conditions of speech: the stricter the social control of the speech situation and the self-control of the speakers of their own speech, the more likely the appearance of euphemisms; and vice versa, in poorly controlled speech situations and with high speech automatism, direct designations are preferred - dysphemisms; (Ruzieva, 2021: 1600)

Social conditioning of ideas about what may be a euphemism. Among the factors that determine the conditions for the use of euphemisms, the following can be distinguished:

— The factor of context (contributing or hindering the euphemistic function of a linguistic unit): the same euphemism behaves differently in different conditions of the context, that is, it does not realize its euphemistic potential to the same extent (Katsev, 1989: 41);

— Factor of ease / determinism of communication: the stricter the control of the speech situation and self-control of the speaker over his own speech, the more likely the appearance of euphemisms, and, on the contrary, with weak control and high automatism of speech (communication in an informal setting), euphemisms may be preferred to "direct" designations or dysphemism (Krysin, 1994: 30);

— Style factor: there is a stylistic fixation of euphemism for a certain style of speech, euphemisms of scientific, official business, journalistic style, fiction, colloquial and everyday style, extra-literary vocabulary are distinguished (Senichkina, 2008: 32), "the euphemistic vocabulary represents all three main styles: sublime, neutral and reduced" (Katsev, 1989: 37-38);

— The factor of social determinism: some euphemisms are inherent in urban general colloquial speech, others are used in the speech of rural residents, etc. (Senichkina, 2008: 32);

— The factor of social relativity: "What in one environment is regarded as a euphemism, in another environment may receive different evaluations" (Krysin, 1994: 389);

— Factor of the speaker's speech culture: the dependence of the appearance of euphemisms in speech on what type of speech culture the speaker is;

— Time factor: "euphemia is a universal both in time and space" (Katsev, 1989: 30), that is, the functioning of a linguistic unit as a euphemism is determined by time frames, and words used as euphemisms do not remain so permanently, there is a contamination, "dysphemization" of euphemisms. B.A. Larin speaks of the fragility of euphemisms: an essential condition for the effectiveness of a euphemism is the presence of an unacceptable equivalent, and as soon as this implied expression goes out of use, the euphemism loses its ennobling properties, passing into the category of direct names, and then requires a new replacement (Ruzieva, 2021: e-conference Globe).

In this regard, A. M. Katsev distinguishes: erased euphemisms (which have almost lost their euphemistic function and are still used only by virtue of tradition); true euphemisms (productive at this historical stage, with great euphemistic potential); true euphemisms with an additional stylistic effect (euphemisms combined with irony and humor) (Katsev, 1989: 41).
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