

Pragmatic Functions of Euphemisms in German and Uzbek

Shoimov Amriddin Shodmonovich

Assistant teacher of Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Email: amriddinshoimov@gmail.com

Abstract. *Pragmatics, originally derived from the Greek word pragma meaning action or activity, is a linguistic field that examines the relationship between linguistic signs and their users. Within modern linguistics, euphemisms have attracted growing scholarly attention, particularly from a pragmatic perspective. This article investigates the pragmatic functions of euphemisms in German and Uzbek, focusing on how speakers employ them to achieve communicative goals such as politeness, mitigation, manipulation and social adaptation. The study is based on comparative analysis of examples drawn from literary texts, media discourse and everyday communication in both languages. The findings demonstrate that euphemisms function not merely as lexical substitutes but as pragmatic tools shaped by social norms, cultural taboos and contextual factors. While the pragmatic purposes of euphemisms in German and Uzbek show significant similarities, the domains of taboo and acceptable indirectness differ according to cultural traditions. In Uzbek, euphemisms are more frequently associated with family, religion and moral values, whereas in German they are commonly linked to death, illness, disability and political correctness. The study highlights the importance of euphemisms as a dynamic linguistic phenomenon reflecting the interaction between language, culture and pragmatic intention.*

Keywords: *Euphemism, Pragmatics, German Language, Uzbek Language, Tabo, Politeness, Discourse, Linguistic Manipulation*

Introduction

In contemporary linguistics, increasing attention has been paid to the pragmatic dimension of language, which focuses on language use in concrete communicative situations. Pragmatics examines how meaning is shaped not only by linguistic structures but also by context, speaker intention and social conventions. Within this framework, euphemisms represent a particularly significant linguistic phenomenon, as they reveal how speakers consciously modify expressions in order to avoid offence, mitigate negative connotations or influence the recipient's interpretation of reality.

Euphemisms are generally known as softer expression than the potentially harsh, blunt, or offensive one which would serve as a paraphrase, or fewer phrases or words referring to the same thing. But contemporary linguistic scholarship has shown that euphemism is not simply a lexical replacement. Rather, they are pragmatic devices that allow speakers to accomplish particular communicative goals: politeness, emotional mitigation, social peace, and sometimes, subversion. Thus, euphemistic language is not just a question of linguistic phenomenon but also of cultural values, moral norms and power relations within discourse.

The study of euphemisms has evolved alongside the development of pragmatics as an independent field within linguistics. Since the second half of the twentieth century, scholars have increasingly emphasised the role of the language user and communicative intention, leading to what is often referred to as the "pragmatic turn" in linguistic research. In this context, euphemisms are analysed as speech acts whose interpretation depends on shared knowledge, social expectations and situational factors.

This article aims to examine the pragmatic functions of euphemisms in German and Uzbek from a comparative perspective. By analysing examples from literary texts, media discourse and everyday communication, the study seeks to identify both universal pragmatic strategies and culture-specific patterns of euphemistic usage. Particular attention is paid to the role of taboo, politeness and social sensitivity in shaping euphemistic expressions. Through this analysis, the article contributes to a deeper understanding of euphemisms as a dynamic and culturally embedded phenomenon in modern linguistic interaction.

Methodology

The study of euphemisms has a long tradition in linguistic research and has been approached from various theoretical perspectives. Early studies primarily focused on euphemisms as lexical phenomena associated with taboo avoidance and semantic substitution. Within this framework, euphemisms were often interpreted as secondary nominations replacing words with negative or socially unacceptable meanings. However, with the development of semiotics, stylistics and pragmatics, euphemisms have increasingly been analysed as complex communicative tools rather than isolated lexical units [Zöllner 1997].

From a semiotic perspective, euphemisms are viewed as signs that indirectly represent reality through symbolic or metaphorical nomination. This approach emphasises the relationship between linguistic form and underlying meaning, highlighting the role of euphemisms in encoding sensitive concepts in an indirect manner. In stylistic studies, euphemisms are examined in terms of expressive value, register and functional variation. Scholars debate whether euphemisms should be classified as tropes or as neutral nominative devices, while particular attention is paid to their role in softening, embellishing or poeticising expression [Fayziyeva 2023].

Semantic approaches to euphemisms focus on meaning change, semantic shift and connotative modification. Within this framework, euphemisms are analysed either from a semasiological perspective, which investigates changes in meaning, or from an onomasiological perspective, which examines the choice of linguistic forms used to name a particular concept. These approaches underline the importance of connotation and evaluative meaning in euphemistic expressions.

More recent research has emphasised the pragmatic approach, which considers euphemisms as context-dependent speech acts motivated by communicative intention. From this perspective, euphemisms serve pragmatic functions such as politeness, face-saving, mitigation, manipulation and social control. This approach is particularly relevant for comparative studies, as pragmatic strategies are closely linked to cultural norms and social expectations [Гулямова 2020].

The present study adopts a comparative and descriptive methodology. The research material consists of examples of euphemisms extracted from German and Uzbek literary works, media texts and everyday communicative contexts. The data are analysed using pragmatic analysis, contextual interpretation and comparative methods in order to identify similarities and differences in euphemistic usage across the two languages. Particular attention is paid to the interaction between linguistic form, pragmatic function and cultural background [Fayziyeva 2023].

Results

The examination of the corpora indicates that euphemisms in German and Uzbek perform many more pragmatic functions than just a lexeme replacement. Euphemism is used in both languages as a strategy for conversation and speech about taboo topics, and may be employed to relate these delicate subjects, vary the management of these interpersonal relations and adjust language to the social and cultural climate. The results suggest that euphemisms function at multiple pragmatic levels, mixing politeness strategies, avoidance of taboo words, and conversational efficiency.

The biggest finding relates to the concept of euphemisms and its role in deactivating socially or

emotionally charged content. Euphemistic forms for death, illness, poverty and social deviance are common in both languages. These expressions mitigate the negative emotional impact of information and allow the speakers to maintain social harmony. E.g. metaphorical or indirect nominations are generally used instead of direct nominations of death so as to soften the communicative impact on the addressee.

Also, the use of euphemism as a politeness and face-saving strategy. Interpersonally, speakers in both languages used euphemisms as a politeness strategy to avoid giving offence or to avoid threatening the social face of the interlocutor. This function is shown especially in references of age, physical state as well as deficiencies. The objective to indicate a pragmatic meaning is similar but the linguistic strategies used differ based on culture specific norms and conventions.

Despite the importance of euphemism in political, media, and institutional discourse, the analysis also reveals some of its limitations. Euphemistic language in such contexts is employed to conceal an unpleasant reality, invalidate a negative assessment or impact public opinion. These euphemisms are a tool of pragmatic manipulation that adjusts the focus of events and processes to seem less harsh or more beneficial to the observer. This tendency is observed in the spheres of Economics and Politics in German on the one hand and Uzbek on the other, but the lexical choice is a reflection of the specific socio-political tradition.

Moreover, the results indicate that the second reason is created by the cultural aspects that richly shape the domains of euphemistic usage by one language community. Uzbek euphemism is related to a family relation, religion and moral value, this fact shows us that high rate of respectfulness and social sensitivity in these areas. German euphemisms are in turn more often associated with death, disease, disabilities and political correctness, indicating a different constellation of societal taboos.

Overall, the findings confirm that euphemisms function as pragmatic instruments shaped by cultural context, communicative goals and social norms, rather than as purely linguistic ornaments.

Discussion

Pragmatics, derived from the Greek word *pragma* meaning action or activity, was originally a philosophical concept. In linguistics, it has developed into an independent field known as pragmatic linguistics, which emerged as a distinct discipline in the 1960s and 1970s. Pragmatics focuses on the relationship between linguistic signs and their users, examining how meaning is shaped by context, intention and interpretation rather than by linguistic form alone [Safarov 2008: 40, 55].

The pragmatic use of euphemisms is of particular importance, as it requires a clear understanding of communicative intention and its distinction from other linguistic goals. While syntax examines the formal relationships between linguistic signs independently of their referents or interpreters, and semantics analyses the relationship between signs and the objects or concepts they denote, pragmatics investigates the relationship between linguistic signs and their users. In this sense, euphemisms can be regarded as linguistic units whose full meaning and function can only be understood within a concrete communicative situation [Romanov 2021: 7].

With the development of linguistic research, scholarly interest in euphemisms has steadily increased. Contemporary studies identify at least four major approaches to the analysis of euphemisms: the semiotic, stylistic, semantic and pragmatic approaches. Each of these perspectives highlights different aspects of euphemistic usage and contributes to a comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon.

The semiotic approach

The semiotic approach is concerned with the nomination of the same object through different linguistic forms. Within this framework, euphemisms are regarded as a specific type of secondary nomination. They function as signs, symbols or indicators that do not express meaning directly but rather convey it indirectly through associative or metaphorical representation. From a semiotic perspective, euphemisms allow speakers to refer to sensitive or taboo concepts without naming them explicitly,

thereby reducing potential communicative tension.

German: „der letzte Weg“ (so‘nggi yo‘l)Uzbek: „oq yo‘l bo‘lsin“

In such cases, the euphemistic expressions operate as symbolic representations that evoke socially shared interpretations rather than literal meanings.

The Stylistic Approach

When we talk about the stylistic approach, there are some questions which are interrelated. However, there is some controversy regarding at least one of the uses of euphemism: whether euphemisms should be treated as tropes, or as an unmarked nominative device. Euphemisms are both seen as figurative language: ornamental or refined expression (creating substantiated speech) but also functional naming strategy that is driven by needs (Shultz, 2001). Another side of this approach is tangentially relevant to this essay as it relates to the functional role of euphemisms in discourse, specifically that of softening or beautifying or poeticising expression.

Another approach of stylistic analysis examines the process of forming euphemisms which engages with play of language and deliberate violation of normative usage. In this vein, euphemisms are considered as matter of speech style, tone and register. These may represent normative, socially-acquiescent speech patterns, or infrequent, context-bound departures driven by expressive or utilitarian reasons.

Nemischa: „in anderen Umständen sein“O‘zbekcha: „umidvor bo‘ldi“

These examples illustrate how stylistic euphemisms contribute to polite and socially acceptable communication by replacing direct expressions with softer alternatives.

The Semantic Approach

The semantic strand looks at how euphemisms are created through semantic change—which semantic content of the euphemism actually means, and to what extent. This perspective can be further split into two sub-approaches: semasiological and onomasiological. Semasiological studies deal with the idiomatic character of euphemisms, emphasizing the aspects of connotation and evaluative meaning. A euphemism can be defined as a lexical unit that has undergone change in its meanings through the process of specialisation or generalisation.

On the contrary the onomasiological approach looks at the linguistic forms that can be used to refer to a given concept. It investigates the motivational foundations, either metaphorical or associative, for the creation of euphemistic expressions and discusses the role of such motivations in the construction of meaning.

Nemischa: „entschlafen“O‘zbekcha: „olamdan o‘tdi“

In both cases, semantic change plays a central role, as the original meanings of the expressions differ from the concepts they euphemistically denote.

The Pragmatic Approach

The pragmatic approach conceptualises euphemisms as forms of speech action. Within this framework, euphemisms are analysed in relation to communicative intention, social context and interactional goals. Speakers employ euphemisms to express respect, maintain politeness, adapt to situational constraints or mitigate the impact of negative information. This approach emphasises that euphemistic meaning is not inherent in linguistic form alone but emerges through use in specific communicative contexts.

Nemischa: „jemanden freisetzen“O‘zbekcha: „ishdan bo‘shatib yuborildi“

Pragmatic Analysis of Euphemisms in German and Uzbek

The following examples provide a clearer illustration of the four approaches to euphemisms discussed above and demonstrate how these perspectives interact in real communicative contexts. In particular, they reveal that euphemisms rarely function within a single analytical dimension but rather combine semiotic, stylistic, semantic and pragmatic features simultaneously.

Sie wird deshalb zum Einfrieren auf unbestimmte Zeit verurteilt.
[J. Zeh 2009: 9]

... Jamoliddinov Dehqonqul Aqrabovich O‘zbekiston Jumhuryati jinoyat tuzugining 153 moddasiga binoan... sakkiz yil muddat bilan ozodlikdan mahrum etiladi! [T. Murod 2022: 336]

In the first example, the euphemism *Einfrieren* is used in the context of a judicial decision to denote a death sentence. From a semiotic perspective, the verb originally meaning “to freeze” functions as a secondary nomination, symbolically replacing the explicit expression “to impose the death penalty”. Stylistically, the choice of this expression serves to soften the severity of the judicial act, reflecting the speaker’s attempt to reduce the emotional impact of the verdict. Semantically, the word is employed in a figurative sense, clearly diverging from its primary lexical meaning. From a pragmatic standpoint, the euphemism allows the speaker to communicate an extremely severe punishment in a more neutral and emotionally distanced manner.

A similar pragmatic intention can be observed in the Uzbek expression *ozodlikdan mahrum etiladi*, which is used instead of a more direct reference to imprisonment. In both cases, euphemistic language functions as a means of mitigating the harshness of legal discourse and maintaining a degree of emotional restraint.

Today the inclination in linguistics is to study any linguistic unit from a pragmatic angle. The research focusing on the relationship between signs in language and the things they refer to marked the emergence of semiotic analysis. Semantics then back, and later pragmatics as an autonomous and therefore able field. Thus, after a period when euphemisms were mainly tackled in the view of their lexical and semantic features, they are now more and more being the subject of pragmatic studies.

The question of which aspects of euphemisms are most closely connected to pragmatic characteristics has become a central issue in modern linguistic research. In the twenty-first century, euphemisms continue to be studied not only from a linguistic but also from a cultural and pragmatic perspective [Graffe 2009: 21]. In both German and Uzbek, euphemisms have gained renewed significance as objects of linguistic investigation, particularly in relation to their role in social interaction and communicative etiquette.

One important area of euphemistic usage concerns the principle of politeness, which constitutes one of the core pragmatic principles of language use. Euphemisms formed on the basis of politeness strategies serve to mitigate various forms of discrimination, including those related to age, gender, ethnicity and physical condition.

Frau Holl, bitte kommen Sie zur Gesinnungsprüfung nach vorn.
[J. Zeh 2009: 149]

Avlodida esi ... esi emas, nima desak ekan ... avlodida esi bundayroqlari bor edimi? [T. Murod 2022: 233]

In these examples, the euphemisms *Gesinnungsprüfung* and *esi bundayroq* demonstrate how speakers attempt to maintain politeness and avoid direct offence. Rather than explicitly naming aggressive surveillance or mental disability, the speakers choose euphemistic expressions that neutralise the information and make it more socially acceptable. The pragmatic aim in both cases is to preserve interpersonal harmony while still conveying the intended meaning.

It can thus be concluded that speech situation, communicative context and a range of extra-linguistic factors create the need for euphemistic expression. Pragmatic factors exert a comprehensive influence on the realisation of euphemisms in discourse, shaping both their form and function.

Taboo, Politeness and Manipulative Functions of Euphemisms

In the process of euphemisation, one of the most prominent pragmatic principles is politeness. Euphemisms formed on the basis of politeness strategies aim to soften potentially offensive or socially sensitive expressions. In both German and Uzbek, euphemistic language is frequently employed to mitigate various forms of discrimination and to maintain respectful interpersonal relations.

Euphemisms serve not only to avoid direct offence but also to create communicative comfort for all participants involved in the interaction. By replacing negatively charged expressions with more neutral or indirect forms, speakers attempt to reduce emotional tension and ensure a smoother flow of communication.

„... Und, wenn ich mir die Bemerkung erlauben darf, Sie sagen ja selber: es war nicht die beste Harmonie zwischen ihnen und ihrem Mann ...“
[H. Rosendorfer 1999: 57]

“Ertalab kasha pishirib yemasam, me‘dam og‘riydi.
„Keksalik-da!“ – deydi qurbonoy xola.
„Meni qari deyapsanmi, xex“.” [O‘. Hoshimov 2002: 3–4]

In these examples, the euphemisms *nicht die beste Harmonie* and *keksalik* illustrate how speakers avoid direct negative evaluation. By employing indirect expressions, the speakers demonstrate consideration for the interlocutor’s feelings and seek to maintain politeness. The pragmatic function of these euphemisms lies in protecting the interlocutor’s social image and reducing the potential for conflict.

Another important pragmatic function of euphemisms is the creation of communicative convenience for all participants in the speech situation. This function is closely linked to the avoidance of unpleasant or emotionally disturbing content.

„Ja, ja, sie sind alle sooo unterprivilegiert. Wenn sie wirklich wollten, konnten sie es auch schaffen“, sagte er scharf. [D. Dörrie 1990: 187]

„Agar...“, dedi pichirlab. „Agar... Sizga bir nima bo‘lsa...“ [O‘. Hoshimov 2002: 41]

In these cases, the euphemisms *unterprivilegiert* and *bir nima bo‘lsa* function as indirect references to poverty and death. Their pragmatic purpose is to avoid explicitly naming distressing realities, thereby maintaining emotional restraint and communicative tact.

Euphemisms also play a significant role in concealing negative information in discourse. In such cases, speakers deliberately avoid direct expressions in order to reduce the psychological impact of unpleasant messages. This function is particularly evident in contexts involving loss, tragedy or personal misfortune.

„Erst einmal: Mein Beileid, Frau Holl. Ich bewundere Ihre Haltung. Die letzten Monate müssen die Hölle für Sie gewesen sein.“ [J. Zeh 2009: 68]

„Ayolimiz... odam bo‘lmadi...“ [T. Murod 2022: 19]

Here, the euphemisms *Ihre Haltung* and *odam bo‘lmadi* serve to veil painful realities, such as death or severe suffering. By employing euphemistic expressions, speakers aim to convey empathy and emotional support while avoiding direct confrontation with distressing facts.

Political, Economic and Media Discourse

In political and public discourse, euphemisms often fulfil a manipulative function. They are used to influence public perception, justify controversial actions or downplay negative developments. In such contexts, euphemistic language becomes a strategic tool of communication, allowing speakers to frame reality in a more acceptable or favourable manner [Vytivskyi 2023].

Today the inclination in linguistics is to study any linguistic unit from a pragmatic angle. The research focusing on the relationship between signs in language and the things they refer to marked the emergence of semiotic analysis. Semantics then back, and later pragmatics as an autonomous and therefore able field. Thus, after a period when euphemisms were mainly tackled in the view of their lexical and semantic features, they are now more and more being the subject of pragmatic studies.

Das dritte Quartal ist nach der heutigen Schätzung das erste Quartal mit einem Minuswachstum in diesem Jahr. [<https://www.spiegel.de>]

2023 yili AQSHda iqtisodiy turg‘unlik bo‘lish xavfi bor.

[\[https://qalampir.uz\]](https://qalampir.uz)

In these examples, the euphemistic expressions *Minuswachstum* and *iqtisodiy turg'unlik bo'lish xayfi* serve to soften the notion of economic decline. Rather than directly referring to economic crisis or recession, the speakers employ linguistically mitigated forms that reduce the perceived severity of the situation. The pragmatic function of such euphemisms lies in managing public perception and preventing panic.

In recent years, research on euphemisms has increasingly focused on their role in contexts of war and armed conflict. Studies analysing euphemistic language in political and military discourse demonstrate that euphemisms are widely used to obscure violence, downplay human suffering and legitimise aggressive actions. This tendency has been observed in various geopolitical contexts, where euphemistic terminology replaces direct references to warfare, invasion or casualties.

Euphemisms also occupy a central position in literary discourse. In modern German literature as well as in Uzbek prose, euphemistic expressions are frequently used to convey socially sensitive themes in an indirect manner. Through euphemisation, authors are able to address taboo topics while maintaining stylistic elegance and emotional distance.

“Trotzdem, langsam werde ich richtig betrunken, und als Nigel aus seinem Tütchen eine Pille nimmt und sie mir in die Hand drückt, denke ich: Na ja, ich kann das ja mal versuchen.” [Ch. Kracht 2007: 43]

“Papiros chekmaydigan, taryoq yemaydigan odam-da.” [T. Murod 2022: 19]

In these examples, euphemistic expressions are used to refer indirectly to drug consumption. The pragmatic purpose is to avoid explicit naming of socially undesirable behaviour while still conveying the intended meaning. Such usage highlights the role of euphemisms in maintaining narrative subtlety and social sensitivity.

Beyond literature and politics, euphemisms are also widely employed in economic and commercial contexts, particularly in advertising. Scholars note that entire advertising texts may consist of euphemistic language designed to manipulate consumer perception and encourage positive emotional responses [Pătru 2019: 62].

“Ruhige Nächte. Spannende Tage.” [<https://neuroflash.com>]

This short advertising slogan exemplifies how euphemistic language can conceal natural or potentially unpleasant processes while emphasising positive outcomes. The pragmatic goal is to influence the recipient's attitude towards the product by framing it in emotionally appealing terms.

Implication, Abbreviation and Generalisation of Pragmatic Functions

One prominent feature of euphemisms is their proximity to the concept of implicature, namely pragmatically conveyed information not deemed verbalised. Euphemistic expressions are such that the real meaning is said indirectly, that is via shared knowledge of the speaker and the listener. This partially implicit nature renders euphemisms especially powerful in pragmatic terms as people are able to convey sensitive content by not overtly articulating it.

One of the primary factors underlying euphemism formation is taboo. In both German and Uzbek, taboo-related topics such as death, illness and moral transgressions frequently motivate euphemistic expression.

„... und überhaupt, wären die Kinder nicht gewesen, Frau Niedermayer hätte nicht mehr leben wollen und wäre ihrem Mann dahin gefolgt, wo er nun war.“ [F. Stalman 1992: 179]

“Rahmatlik maktab direktorimizni qizlari ko'p edi. Qaysi birlari bo'ldi?” [T. Murod 2022: 19]

In these examples, euphemisms related to death function as pragmatic strategies for addressing a socially sensitive topic. By avoiding direct reference to death, speakers demonstrate respect and emotional restraint, which are culturally valued forms of communicative behaviour.

Another essential pragmatic function of euphemisms is politeness. Euphemistic language enables

speakers to avoid direct criticism, humiliation or offence by replacing explicit expressions with indirect ones. This function is particularly evident in references to personal characteristics, social status and physical or mental conditions.

„Wenn man die Dicke sieht ... versteht man es ja ...“ [H. Rosendorfer 1999: 48]

“Bilaman, siz aytmasangiz ham bilaman ...” [T. Murod 2022: 144]

Here, the omission of explicit reference and the use of ellipsis serve a pragmatic purpose: the speaker refrains from naming an unpleasant reality directly, thereby maintaining communicative tact and social harmony [Katsev 1975: 39].

Euphemisms also frequently appear in the form of abbreviations, especially in institutional and bureaucratic discourse. The pragmatic motivation behind such abbreviations is often to neutralise or depersonalise socially sensitive concepts, making them more acceptable in official communication.

German examples:

- WC
- ALG II
- AsylbLG
- EDV

Uzbek examples:

- OITS / SPID
- JPM
- MTJ
- YO‘BA

These abbreviations function as euphemistic substitutes for expressions that may sound harsh, frightening or socially stigmatising. Their pragmatic effect lies in creating emotional distance and increasing communicative efficiency.

In political language, euphemisms reveal a particularly strong manipulative dimension. Political discourse often prioritises short-term pragmatic goals over accurate representation of reality. Euphemistic expressions are therefore employed to obscure facts, legitimise actions or influence public opinion.

“The golden age of America begins right now. From this day forward, our country will flourish and be respected again all over the world.” [<https://www.scmp.com/news/world/united-states-canada/article/3295585>: 22.01.2025]

“Das Goldene Zeitalter von Amerika beginnt genau jetzt. Von diesem Tag an wird unser Land blühen ...”

"Amerikaning oltin asri hozirdanoq boshlanmoqda ..."

In this example, euphemistic expressions such as *golden age* and *will flourish* are used to create an idealised vision of the future, appealing to emotions rather than presenting verifiable realities. The pragmatic intention is clearly manipulative, aiming to inspire trust and optimism while diverting attention from potential social or economic challenges.

Finally, euphemisms may be classified into traditional and pragmatically motivated types. Traditional euphemisms are used to replace expressions that are generally considered inappropriate or taboo across contexts. Pragmatically motivated euphemisms, by contrast, emerge in specific communicative situations and are often characterised by irony or implicit criticism.

„Sie dürfen ja wissen, dass man in der südlichen Sahara Knallbonbons ausprobiert.“ [F. May 1963: 32]

“Xalq holdan toyib, Toshkanni mudofaa qilolmay qolibdi. Oqqoshsho saharlayin Toshkanni bosibdi.”
[T. Murod 2022: 3]

In such cases, euphemisms soften references to war and violence while simultaneously conveying evaluative or ironic meaning. This illustrates that euphemisms are not merely instruments of politeness but also powerful pragmatic tools used to achieve diverse communicative objectives.

Conclusion

This study has examined the pragmatic functions of euphemisms in German and Uzbek from a comparative perspective, demonstrating that euphemisms constitute an essential and dynamic component of communicative practice in both languages. The analysis confirms that euphemisms are not merely stylistic embellishments or lexical substitutes, but pragmatically motivated choices shaped by context, speaker intention and socio-cultural norms.

The findings reveal that German and Uzbek euphemisms share several core pragmatic functions, including politeness, mitigation, taboo avoidance and the management of sensitive information. At the same time, the study highlights clear cultural differences in the domains where euphemistic language is most actively employed. In Uzbek, euphemisms are closely linked to family relations, religion and moral values, reflecting a strong emphasis on respect and social harmony. In German, euphemistic usage is more frequently associated with death, illness, disability and political correctness, particularly in institutional and media discourse.

Furthermore, the analysis demonstrates that euphemisms play a significant role in political, economic and media communication, where they often serve manipulative purposes. In such contexts, euphemistic language functions as a pragmatic strategy for framing reality, neutralising negative connotations and influencing public perception. This aspect underscores the importance of euphemisms as instruments of social and ideological interaction.

By preserving the original German and Uzbek examples, the study emphasises the necessity of analysing euphemisms within their authentic linguistic and cultural environments. Only in their original form can the full pragmatic potential of euphemistic expressions be adequately understood. The research thus contributes to the broader field of pragmatic linguistics by illustrating how euphemisms reflect the complex interaction between language, culture and communicative intention. Future research may further explore euphemisms in other language pairs or focus on specific discourse types, such as digital communication or institutional language, in order to deepen our understanding of euphemistic strategies in contemporary society.

References

- Berger, K. H. (1977). *Getünchte Gräber*. Verlag das Neue Berlin, Berlin, 161, 168 S.
- Brauksiepe, Jochen, (1999) *Thomas und Lucky*. Fouque Literaturverlag, - 96.
- Dörrie, Doris. (1990). *Was wollen Sie von mir?* Diogenes Verlag AG, Zürich, 187.
- Fayziyeva, N. N. (2023). *Siyosiy diskurs evfemizmlarining kommunikativ–pragmatik xususiyatlari. Filologiya fanlari bo‘yicha falsafa doktori (PhD) dissertatsiyasi avtoreferati*, Toshkent, 15.
- Graffe, L. P. (2009). *Die Tabuisierung des Schimpfens im Unterricht von Deutsch als Fremdsprache*. Diss., Curtitiba/Leipzig, 21.
- Kracht, Ch. (2007). *Faserland*. Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag GmbH, München, 43.
- Hoshimov, O‘tkir. (2002). *Tushda kechgan umrlar. G‘ofur G‘ulom nomidagi Adabiyot va san‘at nashriyoti*, Toshkent, 3-4, 41, 43.
- May, F. (1963). *Mordsache Bar*. Deutscher Militärverlag, Berlin, 32.
- Rosendorfer, Herbert. (1999). *Der China-Schmitt*. Verlag Kiepenheuer & Witsch, Köln, 48.
- Stalman, Franziska. (1992). *Champagner und Kamillentee*. Piper, München/Zürich, 179.
- Tog‘ay Murod. (2022). *Otamdan qolgan dalalar*. ZUKKO KITOBXON nashriyot-matbaa uyi, Toshkent, 19, 144, 233, 336.
- Wanzeck, Ch. (2010). *Lexikologie. Beschreibung von Wort und Wortschatz im Deutschen*.

- Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 82.
- Zeh, Juli. (2009). *Corpus Delicti. Ein Prozess.* Schöffing & Co. Verlag, Frankfurt am Main, 9, 68, 149.
- Zöllner, N. (1997). *Der Euphemismus im alltäglichen und politischen Sprachgebrauch des Englischen.* Lang, Frankfurt am Main, 154, 351.
- Гулямова, Ш. К. (2020). Ўзбек тили эвфемизмларнинг гендер хусусиятлари. Фалсафа доктори (PhD) диссертацияси автореферати, Бухоро, 14, 20.
- Кацев, А. М. (1975). О социолингвистическом подходе к проблеме эвфемизмов. Проблемы интерпретации текста, Л., ЛГПИ, 39.
- Романов, С. И. (2021). Лингвокультурогический аспект эвфемизмов. Автореферат, Тула, 7.
- Сафаров, Ш. (2008). Прагмалингвистика. Монография, “Шарк”, Тошкент, 40, 51, 55, 58.
- Neuroflash. (2024). Slogans-Claims. <https://neuroflash.com/de/blog/slogans-claims>
- Qalampir. (2025). <https://qalampir.uz/uz/news/>
- South China Morning Post. (2025). <https://www.scmp.com/news/world/united-states-canada/article/3295585>